NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXL.

MARCH, 1909.

THE CHURCH AND THE REPUBLIC.

BY HIS EMINENCE, CARDINAL GIBBONS.

I.

FIFTEEN millions of Catholics live their lives in our land with undisturbed belief in the perfect harmony existing between their religion and their duties as American citizens. It never occurs to their minds to question the truth of a belief which all their experience confirms. Love of religion and love of country burn together in their hearts. They love their Church as the divine spiritual society set up by Jesus Christ, through which they are brought into a closer communion with God, learn His revealed truth and His holy law, receive the help they need to lead Christian lives and are inspired with the hope of eternal happiness. They love their country with the spontaneous and ardent love of all patriots, because it is their country and the source to them of untold blessings. They prefer its form of government before any other. They admire its institutions and the spirit of its laws. They accept the Constitution without reserve, with no desire, as Catholics, to see it changed in any feature. They can with a clear conscience swear to uphold it.

With an appreciation, the greater because their fathers or they themselves have known persecution,—in the British Isles, in Ger-

Copyright 1909, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many, in Poland and elsewhere,—they prize both the liberty they enjoy as citizens and the liberty assured to the Church. The separation of Church and State in this country seems to them the natural, inevitable and best conceivable plan, the one that would work best among us, both for the good of religion and of the State. Any change in their relations they would contemplate with dread. They are well aware, indeed, that the Church here enjoys a larger liberty and a more secure position than in any country to-day where Church and State are united. They have a deep distrust and strong dislike of the intermeddling of the State with the concerns of religion: and such a restriction as the Church was obliged to endure in France, binding the Pope to choose Catholic bishops only from among the candidates presented to him by unbelieving Government officials, seems to them,—not fully appreciating the difficulties of the situation,—a scandal and a shame. They most assuredly desire never to see a like system introduced into the governing of the Church in America. No establishment of religion is being dreamed of here, of course, by any one; but, were it to be attempted, it would meet with the united opposition of the Catholic people, priests and prelates.

Catholics feel at home among their countrymen. They are conscious of an unstained record of loyalty, of patriotic self-sacrifice and of law-abiding behavior. Their dearest ambition is to live in peace with all, to antagonize no class; they are conscious of no barrier separating them more than any other element of the population into a class apart. Strong in the knowledge that an overwhelming majority of their fellow-citizens understand and appreciate them, they usually ignore the occasional insults directed to them by a small and rapidly decreasing section of the community not yet emancipated from ancestral misconception and prejudices, and still wedded to the conviction that the Gospel is to be propagated by slander and the fomentation of religious strife.

This form of religious propaganda Catholics know to be abhorrent to the spirit of every true American; and on that spirit they rely to nullify the spasmodic efforts of bigotry; for, though a large proportion of the non-Catholics do not sympathize with Catholic doctrines, this dissent is not carried over into political or social life. Men have learned in this country to disagree pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foundly without rancor or bitterness. With no compromise of principle on either side, moral worth, sterling character, kindly qualities of mind and heart bind together in good-will, admiration and friendship the lives of those who do not worship at the same altar. The non-Catholic American would receive with a contemptuous smile or an indignant gesture any suggestion that his Catholic friend, or business associate, carried hidden in his heart some sinister tenet that gave the lie to his life, and might at any moment oblige him to turn traitor to the Republic.

The Catholic himself feels, as he has learned from the lips of his own revered and trusted teachers of religion, that the more faithful he is to his religion the better and nobler citizen will he be. That religion and patriotism could ever come into conflict in his bosom seems to him an utter impossibility; and in the religious principles which he has received in common with his fellow Catholics he sees the surest defence of the State against the forces of disorder and lawlessness, and the insidious influences that work for the overthrow of our Christian moral standards in private and public life.

Such are the conditions that exist, in themselves admirable, and gratifying to the statesman, to the churchman, to the lover of religion and country; to all who rejoice in the spread of good-will and peace among men. Who would dare to introduce religious strife among us, to disturb this peace, and set the torch to the Temple of Concord?

II.

Of this body of American citizens living such a life and imbued with such sentiments (of which there are almost as many proofs as there are Catholics), two synods of Protestant ministers have deemed it just and wise to proclaim to the country that Catholics cannot be trusted with political office; that they cannot sincerely subscribe to the Federal Constitution; that their loyalty is illogical, being contrary to the teaching of the Church; that their religion is opposed to American liberties; and that they themselves, kept in the dark by their religious guides, are ignorant of the true nature of their Church's doctrines. In sounding forth these charges to American Catholics and to the country in general, they declare themselves inspired, not by religious

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

antagonism or the desire to profit by a good opportunity, but solely by patriotic solicitude for the permanence of American institutions.

Charges so contrary to the abiding convictions of American Catholics and so hurtful to their deepest affections are naturally resented; yet they do not appear to have excited any commotion among us. It would indeed be a grave matter if these utterances expressed the judgment of the American nation, indicated its sentiments towards our Catholic citizens and preluded a departure from the national policy of religious liberty and equality before the law. Happily, we know this is very far from the fact. The truth is, we believe, these ministers not only do not represent the American attitude towards us, but would meet with determined opposition if they attempted to carry with them even their own congregations. They have good cause to complain, as they do, of the apathy of their co-religionists. Catholics are convinced that the nation recognizes its own voice in President Roosevelt's letter to Mr. J. C. Martin rather than in the pronouncements it provoked. There they hear the ring of genuine Americanism; and they catch in the other the echo of old cries, of which they have long grown weary.

III.

It can be pleasant to none of us to be called upon, not only to prove our title to convictions which have guided us through life, but to show cause why we should not be deprived of the common political rights of human beings in our own native land. However, I feel obliged to speak out; and if I should speak with warmth on one or two points, it will be because I feel the proposal made deserves the strongest reprobation and is, moreover, entirely unworthy of men in the position of those from whom it emanated. I have no desire to inflict pain, but I cannot avoid characterizing the action of the synods as it deserves. Against the gentlemen themselves I can feel no animosity. They are excellent men in many respects, no doubt, and mean to be good citizens. I am sure, though their spirit does not tend to sweeten American life as much as we might desire, they help to purify and raise its tone, and to keep religion alive in the hearts of their people, and I can only wish them well.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Catholic religion, as they understand it, is in conflict with the Federal Constitution, and with the object of our institutions. Catholics, then, ought not to be trusted with political office. Accordingly, Americans should seek to exclude Catholics from the chair of the President who is called upon to enforce the Constitution; from the Supreme Bench, whose duty it is to interpret it; from the Senate and the House of Representatives, which have the power to change it. And as the chief evil dreaded from Catholics is a modification of the existing relations between Church and State, a power theoretically reserved to our State Governments, no Catholic should be chosen Governor, State legislator or judge of a supreme State court. This is the scope of their meaning, though not all explicitly avowed. It would logically be desirable to deny Catholics the right to vote, and with men in the frame of mind their attitude suggests, the realization of this desire in the statute-books, and of their complete programme, would only be a matter of their possessing sufficient power and judging the act politically expedient.

Now this proposal to exclude Catholics from office,—for it is no mere theory, but a practical programme earnestly recommended to the American public by two solemn assemblies,—is advocated expressly in the interest of religious liberty and for the sake of preserving the Federal Constitution. That document says: "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." Just understand here, however, remark these Lutheran and Baptist synods, an amendment or rather, let us say, a little clause which brings out the sense with admirable clearness: "provided, of course, that this provision be not understood to apply to Roman Catholics."

Such restrictions on religion have always been felt to be incompatible with American ideas and have fallen, though sometimes only after a long struggle, before the force of the real American spirit. "When the Constitution came before the State conventions, . . . in Massachusetts alone was a dread of liberty expressed. Major Lusk 'shuddered at the idea that Roman Catholics, Papists and Pagans might be introduced into office, and that Popery and the Inquisition may be established in America.' 'Who,' answered the Rev. Mr. Shute, 'shall be excluded from natural trusts? Whatever answer bigotry may suggest, the dictates of candor and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equity, I conceive, will be, None.'"* The Puritan clergyman carried his point and Massachusetts endorsed the Federal Constitution. Most of the State constitutions, however, were not at first characterized by the same perfect liberty. Seven of them debarred Catholics from office or citizenship; six expressly, one by requiring naturalized citizens to abjure any foreign *ecclesiastical* allegiance. Unitarians in one State, Jews and unbelievers in several, were likewise subjected to civil disabilities. But in the course of time all restrictions against adherents of any religion were swept away. The removal of these civil disabilities has always, I believe, been considered a triumph of the American spirit; and the Lutheran and Baptist synods will find it difficult to persuade the public to write the synodical concept of religious liberty and civil equality upon our statute-books. They will not attempt it; but shall we take pride in the removal of such laws from the statute-books and counsel our citizens to engrave them upon their hearts?

That Americans in general do not believe in these synodical principles is shown at every election, when, as Mr. Roosevelt has pointed out, districts predominantly Catholic have repeatedly elected Protestants to office, and, *vice versa.* Catholics have been chosen by several strongly Protestant States as their Chief Magistrates or as their representatives in the Senate. Presidents of the United States have shown no lack of confidence in them, calling them into their cabinet, elevating them to the bench of the Supreme Court, one of whose Chief Justices was a Catholic, and charging them with important posts at home and abroad. Religious issues have sometimes been injected into campaigns, never, however, by Catholics so far as I can recall; but every one has a feeling that it is unfortunate and un-American. It has been done mostly in secret, for its authors were ashamed of the light.

It is a new thing, for the present generation at least, to see the chief authorities of important religious bodies advocating the exclusion of loyal American citizens from office on the sole

* Cobb, "The Rise of Religious Liberty in America," p. 508.

In regard to the persecution directed against Catholics in Colonial times, Mr. Cobb says: "Of all the religious legislation in the Colonies nothing was more absurd than that against Roman Catholics. One would suppose that the Roman Church was a constant and threatening foe to Colonial Institutions. The fact was far otherwise." Pp. 450–451. See also "Maryland, the Land of Sanctuary," by Rev. William Russell.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ground of their religious allegiance. This act will be writ indelibly in the annals of our country in the chapter entitled "Religious Intolerance." And in the same chapter, history ought to record that the action, entirely clerical in origin, received no manifestation of sympathy with its aim or spirit from the laity, who thus earned the blame of their leaders (in things spiritual, but not in politics), and the approbation of the American people.

There must be no tampering with the delicate machinery by which religious liberty and equality are secured, and no fostering of any spirit which would tend to destroy that machinery. Religious passions are deep and strong; and any man in his senses who knows human nature or knows the history of Europe, and has at heart the future peace and happiness of our country, whatever his belief, will do nothing to introduce religious strife into the politics of America. Religious tolerance is not the easy superficial virtue it seems in these placid days; intolerance in the dominating party tends to produce intolerance in the injured party. Then religious peace is near an end, unless strong restraints be used. The spirit of the country has changed much in half a century, and it would be very difficult to arouse such fanaticism as I saw in the Know-nothing days. Prudent men, men who are far-sighted, especially if they are in positions of responsibility, will work for peace and harmony. Such has always been the attitude of our Catholic hierarchy, and, with few exceptions, of our priesthood. I know not what to think of men, putting themselves forward as the leaders of large religious bodies, who counsel the American people to depart from that policy which has promoted peace and good-will among us and made us illustrious among nations for our spirit of liberty and liberality. What good can they hope to accomplish?

They say Catholicism and loyalty are logically incompatible; but if, as they acknowledge, they are felt in fact to be compatible, should they not rejoice? Do they wish to force Catholics to be disloyal? Or do they—ah! perhaps the motive lies here—do they wish to force Catholics to renounce the Pope and become good Protestants? But no, their motive is purely patriotic. Taking Catholicism even at their worst estimate of it, then, should they be willing to introduce into American life all the bitter and hard feeling that a political war on Catholics would certainly precipitate? Willing to incur great and inevitable present evils to ward off a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

danger centuries hence that they cannot believe real? Willing to punish henceforth and forever honest good Catholics whom they themselves acknowledge to be loyal Americans, because their descendants of the dim distant future might have an opportunity, —they would not grasp it, confess even these fearful ones,—to overturn American liberties? We may well smile at the shuddering of Major Lusk; but the proposal of these men in this age is inexcusable.

I am speaking in no tone of deprecation. We have nothing to fear for ourselves. We are strong, not only in our own union and strength, but in the broad American spirit of fair play and love of liberty; and, I may be permitted to add, in our confidence that God destines the Catholic Church in this country to be the bulwark of law and order, of liberty, of social justice and purity. But I speak that I may put forth whatever strength I have to crush this detestable spirit of intolerance which, if it gained strength, would wreck the peace of the country and root out charity from the hearts of men. "Let us uncover the hatchet!" shouts an excited Lutheran organ. Brothers, bury it. Far better for you and for the country if when well out of sight of the Fatherland you had silently dropped your hatchet into the deep.

Still, I do not deny, among some men who would oppose political discrimination against Catholics as unjust, unwise and unnecessary, there remains a certain dread of Catholicism. They acknowledge that the Catholic Church in this country is an immense force for the public welfare, raising up native Catholics as patriotic Americans and moulding her foreign-born elements into a homogeneous people. The very sense of her strength, indeed, is in great part the cause of the dread; they fear the danger of a collision between the State and a Church whose head is a foreigner and believes himself the representative of God upon earth. Catholic teaching, American principles of government and the existing facts will show how baseless is this apprehension.

IV.

The distinction between the civil and the ecclesiastical powers is very firmly established in Catholic teaching. "The Almighty," says Pope Leo XIII, "has appointed the charge of the human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil; the one being set over divine, the other over human things. Each in its kind is supreme, each has fixed limits within which it is contained, limits which are defined by the nature and special object of the province of each. . . ." "Neither obeys the other within the limits to which each is restricted by its constitution." Pius IX approved a pastoral of the Swiss bishops which teaches the same doctrine, that civil magistrates are "invested in their own domain with a full sovereignty," and that to them "we owe obedience and respect in all things morally permitted and belonging to the domain of civil society." This is but common Catholic doctrine.

The Church, then, holds that the civil government has divine authority, just as has the ecclesiastical; that the limits of each are fixed by the nature of its purpose; that within these limits each power is supreme; consequently, that the Church cannot intermeddle in affairs purely civil, nor the State in affairs purely ecclesiastical; and that members of the Church are bound to obey the State, within its own domain, in all things that do not contravene the moral law.

This distinction of the two spheres or zones of authority, as I may call them, lying in the very nature of their object, remains even if all the members of the State be Catholics. Cardinal Tarquini, a Jesuit writer of authority, states this clearly. "Civil society," he says, "even though every member of it be a Catholic, is not subject to the Church, but plainly independent in temporal things which regard its temporal end. . . . This is proved by reason. For, whatsoever is done in temporal matters, having in view a temporal end, is outside the object of the Church. Now, it is a general rule that no society has power beyond its own scope. . . . Hence it follows that the State, although it be composed of Catholics, yet in temporal matters and from a temporal point of view is by no means subordinate to the Church, but quite independent of her."

The establishing and the maintenance of this distinction is one of the greatest contributions of the Catholic Church to civilization. To us, in the twentieth century, the distinction seems obvious, almost self-evident: but in the ancient world religion was a mere function of the State. To the long struggle of the Papacy during the Middle Ages it is due that Christianity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has not sunk into a Byzantine servitude. Guizot, the Protestant historian and statesman, gives to the Popes the credit for having "proclaimed and maintained the difference between Church and State, the distinction of the two societies, of the two powers, of their respective domains and rights."

That in waging this titanic war the Popes always kept strictly within their legitimate domain and even used their spiritual powers with the gentleness of pastors, Catholic historians are not concerned to maintain; Popes are human, and it is plain from history that some of them did not always act moderately, wisely and in the spirit of Christ. But they had to do with a crude, brutal power which would have enslaved religion; and in a fierce struggle for the life of the Church such mistakes, humanly speaking, were inevitable. Only in defining doctrines for universal belief are the Popes infallible. They have been unflinching in maintaining the independence of a spiritual realm upon earth; and those who are so ready to pardon the mistakes of the great men of history whose work has uplifted humanity ought to be able to find some condonation for the occasional excessive claims of Popes, when it is realized that their efforts alone saved Europe from spiritual bondage.

When the Reformers rejected the authority of the Church the distinction between the two powers was lost to them. The Church of England became subjected to the despotism of Henry VIII. The latest of the long series of humiliations which this connection has thrown on the Church of England is very recent. After maintaining for generations that the law of God forbids a man to marry his deceased wife's sister, and prohibiting her ministers from celebrating such a marriage, she is obliged to retract her ancient discipline because it has pleased Parliament in which sit Atheists and Agnostics to declare such marriages lawful. The State rules the Church. Lutheranism, so bold in its first outburst, became the creature of the civil powers before Luther's death; it remains so to this day. Zwingli handed over religion to the care of the civil powers. Calvin went to the other extreme. He attempted a theocracy, failed, of course, and his religion likewise was committed to the keeping of the State. Every national Protestant Church has been the creature of the State, subject to it in doctrine, ritual, discipline and government. Only the dissenting sects have been able to maintain a certain independence,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and none of them were averse to union with the State which, with Protestantism, has always meant the subjection of the Church to the State.

The history of the schismatical churches of the East repeats the same story. The Patriarchate of Constantinople was first the creature of the Byzantine Emperors and then of the Mohammedan Sultan. The Church of Russia is the servant of the Tsar. The Churches of the Balkan States, each in turn, broke away from the Patriarchs of Constantinople with the cry, "No head but Christ," only to fall under the despotism of the State.

If history points a lesson, then, it shows that the subjection of the religious to the secular has ever followed separation from the Church of Rome. Now it will be objected that if Protestantism leans too much towards subservience to the State, the Catholic Church on the other hand has often acted strongly against the State, especially in the Middle Ages. I grant it, but I hold it was justified by the consent of nations and the public law of that day. Take the England of that period, for example: "As regards national feeling," says the latest and most scientific Protestant historian of the English Reformation,* "the people evidently regarded the cause of the Church as the cause of liberty. That their freedom suffered grievously by the abolition of Papal jurisdiction under Henry VIII there can be no manner of doubt." Again: "That Rome exercised her spiritual power by the willing obedience of Englishmen in general, and that they regarded it as a really wholesome power, even for the control it exercised over secular tyranny, is a fact which it requires no very intimate knowledge of early English literature to bring home to us."† And Gairdner adds that the separation was brought about by the power of a "despotic king" against the will of the people. In other countries too, as the same writer says, the Popes were on the side of liberty and the people against the despotism of the Crown. The Papacy was then universally considered the embodiment of justice and liberty upon the earth. The Hague Tribunal to-day is a very faint image of the political function and power of the mediæval Papacy; and it is but a voice while the Pope was a living power, restraining and civilizing society. "It is impossible," says the Anglican Dean Milman, "to conceive what had been the

* Gairdner, "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," p. 6.
† *Ib.*, p. 5.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confusion, the lawlessness, the chaotic state of the Middle Ages without the mediæval Papacy." In an age of democracy and liberty some gratitude might be expected for the most powerful defender of the people and of liberty; yet the very success of the Papacy in their defence is the ground of the prejudice that exists against it.

V.

The political authority exercised by the mediæval Popes, then, presupposed a united Christendom and was part of the universally recognized international law. Yet, legitimate and beneficial as it was, it was seized upon by the Reformers as one of their chief arguments against the Papacy, and became one of their pretexts for repudiating Rome's spiritual authority. Ever since, the same weapon has been persistently and effectively employed by Protestant writers and divines against the Catholic religion. In consequence there are many persons to-day who, while they are profoundly impressed and attracted by the beauty, the discipline, the deep spiritual influence, efficient moral force of the Catholic Church, yet hesitate to enter simply because of their views regarding the political power claimed by the Pope in the Middle Ages. That power was lost when the unity of Christendom, on the rise of the modern States, ceased to be a fundamental principle of the law of nations; and when Germany, France, Russia, England and America shall be welded into a world-wide confederation on the plan of the Holy Roman Empire, then and not before need statesmen discuss the possibility of a revival of the mediæval Papacy.

Catholics, then, may subscribe to the fundamental article of English Protestantism, "The Pope of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm," if it be understood of the realm of purely temporal affairs; and while we insist that he has the right to the free exercise of his spiritual authority over Catholics, we believe that in civil matters which do not contravene the moral law, we Catholics owe a full and unreserved allegiance to the civil authorities. The same Divine Voice, as I have often preached in the discharge of my pastoral office,* which gives us the command to render

* See, *e.g.*, the sermon on "Obedience to all Lawful Authority" in my Discourses and Sermons on Various Subjects.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unto God the things of God gives us the other command, of equally binding force, to render unto Cæsar the things of Cæsar.

But an objection is repeatedly cast up to Catholics which, repugnant though it is to my inmost feelings of loyalty and reverence towards the Holy Father, I must take into consideration; for utterly impracticable and absurd as it is in our eyes, it seems to haunt the minds of many outside the Church. Suppose, it is said, the Pope were to issue commands in purely civil matters, should not Catholics be bound to yield him obedience? The Pope will take no such act, we know, even though it is not a part of Catholic Faith that he is infallible in the exercise of his authority; but were he to do so he would stand self-condemned, a transgressor of the law he himself promulgates. He would be offending, not only against civil society, but against God and violating an authority as truly from God as his own. Any Catholic who clearly recognized this would not be bound to obey the Pope; or rather his conscience would bind him absolutely to disobey, because with Catholics conscience is the supreme law which under no circumstances can we ever lawfully disobey.

Some controversialists in this country, gravelled for matter of complaint against the Papal dealings with America, have invented the fable that Pius IX recognized the Southern Confederacy. Of course the facts refute them, as the Pope merely extended to Mr. Jefferson Davis the courtesy which one gentleman owes another of addressing him by his official title. They cling to the serviceable fable; and proceed to shudder at the thought of what might have happened if, in the crisis of our Civil War, the President had been a Catholic. Let me relieve them by stating what would have occurred. A Catholic President would act, under the circumstances, precisely as Abraham Lincoln; he would treat the recognition with a respectful silence, and continue to prosecute the war to the best of his ability. If he acted otherwise he would be a traitor to his conscience and his God, to his country and to the Constitution which he had sworn to uphold. And he would have Catholic theological teaching at his back. The Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine says: "In order to resist and defend oneself no authority is required. . . . Therefore, as it is lawful to resist the Pope if he assaulted a man's person, so it is lawful to resist him if he assaulted souls or troubled the State and much more if he strove to destroy the Church. It is lawful, I say, to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resist him, by not doing what he commands and hindering the execution of his will." My venerable and learned predecessor in the See of Baltimore, Archbishop Kenrick, speaks in a similar strain; the Pope's "power was given for edification, not for destruction; if he uses it for love of domination *(quod absit)* scarcely will he meet with obedient populations."

We may put aside, then, as an absurdity the injurious supposition that the Pope would ever interfere in purely civil affairs. But is there not a twilight zone over which both Church and State put forth claims? True; and I grant that here a collision of authorities comes more within the horizon of possibility. But the American concept of government and of liberty puts this hypothesis outside the range of practical affairs. That concept, as I understand it, is that the Government should leave as large a liberty as possible to individuals and to bodies within the State, only intervening in the interests of morality, justice and the common weal. There are forces at work in the country, I know, that tend to paternalism and Cæsarism in Government; but true Americanism recognizes that these forces would bring disaster on American liberties. So long as these liberties, under which we have prospered, are preserved in their fulness, there is, I assert, no danger of a collision between the State and the Catholic Church.

The admission, however, of the merely theoretical possibility of such a collision keeps alive the apprehension of timid Protestants and is sufficient to determine some of them to deprive Catholics forever of the honor of the Presidency. But if no man were to be considered eligible for the Presidency unless we were certain that under no conceivable circumstances would his conscience come into conflict with any possible legislation, then the first consideration to qualify a man as candidate for the office would be that he should have no conscience at all.

"But," many Protestants say, "we obey our conscience, you obey the Pope." Yes; we obey the Pope, for our conscience tells us that we ought to obey the spiritual authority of the Pope in everything except what is sinful. "But," they reply, "we do not believe that any human power should come between the human conscience and duty." Neither do we; but while you believe in private judgment, we believe in a religion of authority which our conscience tells us is our lawful guide and teacher in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its own sphere. You say that you believe in religious freedom. Do you, however, interpret this freedom to apply only to yourselves; or are you willing to conceive that to others likewise is to be left the freedom to follow their consciences? You can conceive a State passing laws that would violate your conscientious convictions. Would you accept these laws, or would you resist them as your fellow religionists in England recently resisted an education law of which they did not approve? I think you would not prove false to your religious convictions. Were the State to attempt to compel Orthodox Jews to accept the Sunday for the Sabbath or to abandon certain Levitical observances which are sacred in their eyes, they would not be worth their salt if they did not resist this encroachment on their rights. Similarly, for example, if the State should forbid us Catholics to continue our parochial schools we should resist to the uttermost; for we hold that, while the State has the undoubted right to compel her future citizens to receive a certain degree of education, she has no right to deprive them of the daily religious influence which we deem necessary for their spiritual and eternal welfare, as well as for their proper training in the duties of citizenship. In any such essay by the State to establish Cæsarism, Catholics would behave precisely as any other conscientious body would behave. They would not think it necessary to await instructions from any source. We believe in the sacredness and supremacy of conscience; and rulers of the world, from Nero to Clemenceau, have found the Catholic conscience to be a wall of adamant.

VI.

It cannot but be regarded as strange that Protestants should feel free to assail the Catholic Church regarding her position on the union of Church and State. Wherever in Europe the opportunity presented itself, the various Protestant Churches united with the State: nay, rather, they threw themselves at the feet of the State and said: "Rule thou over us. Be thou our King and our Prophet." But the Catholic Church has always retained her spiritual independence; her union with the State has always been an alliance of independent powers, not the subjection of a vassal to her liege lord. Her doctrine on the subject has been this: in a country wholly or predominantly Catholic, the most de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sirable relation is the friendly union and co-operation of Church and State, neither power sacrificing its liberty and each acknowledging the other. That this is the ideal relation, provided liberty be assured to those not of the established church, no sensible man can deny. The Catholic Church states in form of doctrine what all history shows to be inevitable: that where the Church and State are practically two names for the nation viewed as a body of worshippers and as a political entity, it is impossible to prevent an intimate union. If my Protestant friends will show me a free nation that really believes in one religion and has no union of religion with the State I will believe the Catholic doctrine unwarranted. But while the union is ideally best, history assuredly does not prove that it is always practically best. There is a union that is inimical to the interests of religion, and consequently to the State; and there is a separation that is inimical to the interests of religion, and consequently to the State; and there is a separation that is for the best interests of both. In our country separation is a necessity; and it is a separation that works best for the interests of religion, as Mr. Taft recently stated, as well as for the good of the State. I fully agree with him, and I can understand too and sympathize with the great Catholic leader of France, the Count de Mun, who recently exclaimed: "In America separation means the reign of liberty; in France the reign of impiety." American Catholics rejoice in our separation of Church and State; and I can conceive no combination of circumstances likely to arise which should make a union desirable either to Church or State. We know the blessings of our present arrangement; it gives us liberty and binds together priests and people in a union better than that of Church and State. Other countries, other manners; we do not believe our system adapted to all conditions; we leave it to Church and State in other lands to solve their problems for their own best interests. For ourselves, we thank God we live in America, "in this happy country of ours," to quote Mr. Roosevelt, where "religion and liberty are natural allies."

J. CARD. GIBBONS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TARIFF REVISION AND THE NATION'S NECESSITIES.

BY THOMAS H. CARTER, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MONTANA.

THE country has commanded a revision of the tariff after nearly twelve years' experience under the existing law. That command presents to Congress a very perplexing problem, which will be more difficult in the absence of a common understanding of the many important factors to be considered in its solution. The partisan contentions and dogmatic assertions peculiar to a political campaign do not tend to induce the calm and calculating frame of mind essential to close analysis, but rather the opposite.

The air is still surcharged with the echoes of such passion-breeding phrases as "robber tariff," "overgrown infant industries," "tariff-bred trusts," "license to steal," "free trade and hard times," "tariff-tinkering," "soup-house tariff," and so on to the end of the list of picturesque expressions so well known to campaign orators and writers.

Ninety-two Senators and three hundred and ninety-one Members of the House of Representatives come direct from the arena of political controversy to organize a Congress which must revise the tariff on a sound basis, with due regard to the business of the country and the necessities of the Government. Responsibility will very soon bring sobriety of thought to the Senators and Representatives, and particularly those of the majority party, for that party cannot evade full accountability to the people for what may be done or left undone in framing a tariff bill. On the other hand, the public at large, not being charged with any direct obligation to take definite action, can scarcely be expected to emerge from the campaign atmosphere well qualified to scrutinize impartially and determine judicially a proper adjustment of the complex relations of one schedule to another, and of both to the revenue required to carry on the Government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These relations Congress is not at liberty to disregard; and, as the public, inspired by both sentiment and interest, will by petition, protest and criticism exert a potent influence on the law-making body at every stage of the proceeding, it is of the very gravest importance that some common understanding should be reached early in the Session as to certain controlling facts which all must recognize.

It is currently understood that "Tariff Revision" and "Tariff Reduction" are to be regarded as synonymous terms in arriving at a just interpretation of the meaning of the last election.

Market prices are high, measured in dollars without reference to the purchasing power of wages, and the increased cost of living is, in consequence, the subject of almost universal complaint. If wages and incomes can be maintained on the present level, and the cost of living be reduced to a considerable degree, a most satisfactory solution will have been reached; but, unhappily, there are many obstacles in the way. All elements of our economic structure are so interlaced that an artificially maintained high-level of wages, with a low-level of prices for the necessaries of life, cannot long continue. But, while recognizing, as we all do, the desirability of reducing living expenses, we must take into account the fact that Congress cannot exercise unrestrained discretion in reducing tariff duties. The best that can be done, under existing conditions, is to readjust and extend duties so as to correct injustice and inequalities, and increase the aggregate amount of revenue to be derived from customs.

It must be borne in mind that the administration of the Federal Government involves a stupendous business operation conducted on a cash basis, credit being resorted to only in rare instances. The large proportions of the operation render adherence to strict business principles more necessary than in smaller affairs, for a slight deviation from the true line in national legislation may bring disaster to millions of unsuspecting people, whose occupations and fortunes may be seriously affected by the impairment of that confidence in the conduct of the Federal Government which seems to be a necessary inspiration to business enterprise.

In no way can the revenue conditions confronting the new Congress be more clearly set forth than by presenting the estimates of receipts and expenditures furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury for the next fiscal year. These estimates are as follows:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is estimated that, upon the basis of existing laws, the revenues of the Government for the fiscal year 1910 will be:

From customs	$290,000,000.00
From internal revenue	250,000,000.00
From miscellaneous sources	62,000,000.00
From postal revenues	223,340,712.00
Total estimated revenues	$825,340,712.00

The estimates of appropriations required for the fiscal year 1910, as submitted by the Executive Department and offices, are:

Legislative establishment		$7,316,190.75
Executive establishment:		
Executive proper	$415,510.00	
State Department	288,700.00	
Treasury Department	11,447,836.00	
War Department	2,207,068.00	
Navy Department	836,940.00	
Interior Department	5,232,655.00	
Post-Office Department	1,711,040.00	
Department of Agriculture	14,610,626.00	
Department of Commerce and Labor	1,555,300.00	
Department of Justice	500,680.00	
		38,806,355.00
Judicial establishment		972,160.00
Foreign intercourse		3,880,194.72
Military establishment		104,844,635.88
Naval establishment		121,847,472.47
Indian affairs		11,451,576.05
Pensions		161,018,000.00
Public Works:		
Legislative	7,000.00	
Treasury Department	10,000,000.00	
War Department	112,274,455.83	
Navy Department	12,545,975.52	
Department of the Interior	1,452,000.00	
Department of Commerce and Labor	405,000.00	
Department of Justice	470,500.00	
		137,154,931.35
Miscellaneous:		
Legislative	5,854,987.20	
Treasury Department	24,302,971.07	
War Department	6,957,390.48	
Interior Department	5,479,920.00	
Department of Justice	7,804,180.00	
Department of Commerce and Labor	10,445,545.00	
District of Columbia	16,176,355.52	
		77,021,349.27
Postal service		233,978,560.00
Permanent annual appropriations:		
Interest on the public debt	22,500,000.00	
Refunding, customs, internal revenue, etc.	15,203,500.00	
Collecting revenue from customs	5,500,000.00	
Miscellaneous, exclusive of sinking-fund and national-bank redemption fund	26,892,582.52	
		70,096,082.52
Total estimated appropriations		$968,387,508.01

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus it appears that the total estimates of appropriations submitted by the several Executive Departments exceed the estimated revenues of the Government for the fiscal year 1910 by $143,046,796.01.

It will be observed that the postal revenues are estimated as approaching within ten millions of the postal expenditures; whereas it is more than probable that the difference between receipts and expenditures in that and other Departments will be such that the total revenues of the Government, estimated on the basis of existing law, will fall at least $160,000,000 below the appropriations for 1910. This prospect is made still more serious by the assured fact that the revenue for the current fiscal year will be at least $120,000,000 less than the necessary expenditures. Thus it is apparent that the deficiencies for this year and next will inevitably wipe out the surplus in the Treasury, and besides create a deficit to be made good by increasing taxes or by the sale of bonds.

To those who suggest a reduction of expenses, as a means of avoiding either of the alternatives referred to, must be assigned the duty of showing where the reductions can be made without injury to the public service or refusal to meet the insistent demands of the people for public improvements and the safeguarding of the nation's interests.

This apparently simple task will be found more troublesome than it seems. Demands on the Treasury have increased at the rate of about ten per cent. per annum for many years past, and this rate of increase is likely to grow greater rather than less in the immediate future if the call is met for larger appropriations for the improvement of harbors and waterways and for the extension of Government activities in numerous other expensive directions. Taking into account only such outlay as adherence to the present scope of Congressional appropriations involves, in what Department or Departments can we so curtail expenses as to avoid bond issues or additional taxation?

If all appropriations for the Congress, the Courts and our foreign intercourse should be omitted, the whole saving thereby made would be only approximately $12,000,000 or about one and one-quarter per cent. of all the annual appropriations. The Executive establishment absorbs about $39,000,000 annually, but the individual who thinks this can be diminished need only serve

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a few days in Congress to learn how hard it is to resist the never-ending appeals being made for increase of wages and salaries. Then the normal extension of the service to meet the growing requirements of the country must be considered, so that the Congress that keeps the appropriations for the Executive establishment down to the present figures may well be commended.

No one familiar with conditions or mindful of our relations to the nations of the earth will seriously contemplate impairment of the Army or Navy through failure to maintain both on the present footing at least.

Abandonment of rural free delivery would make up the deficiency in the Postal Service, and bring a profit from it at once, but who would expect the twelve million farmers of the country to submit to a saving of thirty-odd millions annually in that way?

Construction of the Panama Canal, the improvement of rivers and harbors, the reclamation of our arid lands and the prosecution of public works generally might be discontinued in the interest of economy, but the American people would not tolerate such action.

Finally, we come to the item for pensions, amounting to over $160,000,000 annually, and here we could, but will not, curtail to make up deficiencies.

In the last analysis, it will be found, on the closest possible inspection, that the little saving which can be made here and there, by practising the strictest kind of economy, will be more than offset by unavoidable additions incident to the normal expansion of the operations of the Government.

If this conclusion is accepted, and I think it will be, our revenue laws must be so amended as to produce sufficient additional income to pay current expenses out of current receipts, if we are henceforth to conduct the Government business on a cash basis.

The Constitution vests in Congress power "to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports and Excises," subject to certain well-known limitations; and, in pursuance of a policy established under the first administration of Washington and adhered to ever since, Congress, in the exercise of this power, has always provided and will in the immediate future provide for the needs of the Treasury, chiefly by tariff duties on importations from foreign countries and by the Internal Revenue collections.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Income from these two sources is supplemented by the earnings of the Postal Service and by miscellaneous receipts, the latter being comparatively limited, fluctuating and unreliable. While many interesting and plausible arguments have been presented in favor of substituting for the ancient system a tax on incomes or a direct tax on land and personal property, as a means of raising national revenue, it would be but a waste of time to discuss here the merits or the constitutionality of any of the substitutes proposed, for it is apparent that no one seriously contemplates a radical departure at this time from a well-established policy. It follows, therefore, that collections from duties on imports must be taken as a main reliance for income to meet public obligations for an indefinite period in the future. Leaving the deficiency for the current fiscal year to be deducted from the accumulated surplus in the Treasury, we must so revise the tariff as to avoid the threatened $160,000,000 annual shortage in revenue for the next and succeeding years. The aggregate amount to be raised annually for that purpose is disclosed by adding the $160,000,000 to the $290,000,000 estimated revenue from customs for 1910, making $450,000,000. This sum will be reduced somewhat by receipts from the sale of Panama Canal bonds; but, even if such receipts should reach the improbable amount of $100,000,000 during the next fiscal year, we would still be compelled to look to customs receipts for the remaining $350,000,000. In the presence of these figures, how can tariff revision be held to mean tariff reduction? Such a view can only be based on the theory that reduction of duties will so stimulate importations as to increase the aggregate of custom-house receipts. This result would obtain when the best revenue-producing rate happened to be fixed, but such rate could only be ascertained by experience; and then, again, the verdict of the country stands on record in favor of a protective tariff rather than a tariff for revenue only. True, the measure of protection to be afforded is the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad; but we are to have a protective tariff subject to that standard of measurement, and subject also to the imperative requirement as disclosed by the figures quoted that customs receipts shall be made to yield from sixty to one hundred million dollars more per annum than the present tariff law yields.

It must always be remembered, in dealing with these condi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, that every dollar of revenue sacrificed by reduction of duty on one item must be made up by adding an equal amount to some other item; and, moreover, the estimated deficiency must be made up. Of course, the probable increase of importations likely to result from reductions will be taken into account; but, after all increases, reductions and adjustments have been made and the minimum rate for protection with the maximum rate for trade aggression shall have been determined, the vital question of adequate revenue will still remain to be answered only by experience, unless that contingency is provided for in the bill. The safeguard employed to provide against the occurrence of a deficiency should not only be adequate, but likewise so flexible as to admit of increase or decrease by executive action as altered relations between revenue and appropriations might from time to time require. It seems that the evils incident to disorder in such relations can be averted, and reciprocity trade treaties encouraged and made possible by imposing a small *ad valorem* duty on all articles now on the free list. Experience has shown that the Reciprocity policy so earnestly advocated by Mr. Blaine and so often approved by the country cannot be carried forward while duties are levied only on imports coming in competition with home productions for which protection is demanded. The Reciprocity treaties heretofore negotiated by the Secretary of State have failed of ratification, because of the very natural opposition of the manufacturers and producers destined to be injuriously affected by the proposed tariff reductions. The wool-grower cannot be expected to consent to a treaty providing for the free admission of Argentine wool into this country in exchange for the privilege of the free entry of agricultural implements into Argentina. The consideration for the exchange would not pass to the wool-grower, but to the manufacturer of agricultural implements.

The same difficulty has been, and always will be, encountered in every attempt to base a Reciprocity treaty on the sacrifice of any protective duty. On the other hand, it is obvious that the remission by treaty of a duty imposed on any article now on the free list would not be opposed by any one. The Secretary of State would have a free hand, and the dream of reciprocal trade treaties would become a reality. The negotiation of the treaties would proceed with proper regard for the National revenues. If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the revised tariff produced ample revenue independent of receipts from the *ad valorem* duties on non-competing imports, these could be rapidly placed on the free list again as to such countries as elected to give us corresponding trade advantages by appropriate treaty stipulations. A limited free list would probably be required to embrace non-competing materials used in manufacturing in order to avoid the adjustment of compensatory duties, but that is a matter of detail.

The essential fact to which attention is directed rests on the availability of the existing free list as a means of increasing the revenue on a basis capable of being made somewhat flexible by executive action, along lines in harmony with, and in furtherance of, the policy of Reciprocity, to which I believe the American people are devoted. Finally, confronted, as we are, with an imperative requirement for more revenue than duties levied for protective purposes will probably supply, what valid objection can be urged against the levy of a uniform *ad valorem* duty on all articles now on the free list, with the possible exception before stated?

In 1908, the value of dutiable imports was $657,415,920, and imports free of duty that year were valued at $525,704,745. For protection of the revenue, articles imported free of duty are subjected to the same rigid inspection as dutiable articles; and, on general principles, it is difficult to comprehend why the importer should not at least pay the cost of such inspection, unless some compensatory trade advantage is extended to our people in the ports of the exporting country. There is not only an element of justice in the proposed *ad valorem* levy, but there is virtue in the policy in that it would open the way for fair reciprocal trade treaties, which additional internal revenue taxation would in no sense tend to promote.

THOMAS H. CARTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BURNS, THE POET OF DEMOCRACY.

BY HAMILTON WRIGHT MABIE.

FRANCIS JEFFREY was arrested on High Street, in Edinburgh, one morning, years ago, by the figure of a young man of striking nobility of bearing and flashing black eyes. As he stood looking, the door of a shop opened and a man came out, put a hand on his shoulder and said, "Aye, laddie, ye may weel look at that man; that's Robbie Burns." There Robbie Burns still stands. Scotland began to look at him in 1786, when the first book of poems came unannounced from Kilmarnock; the English-speaking world has been looking at him for decades. There he stands with those flashing eyes which enthralled Walter Scott; as much a part of Scotland as Arthur's Seat, or Stirling Castle, or Ben Nevis, or those Highland glens through which the clouds pass and repass in endless procession; as the moors, beautiful beyond speech in a silence which is the presence of Nature herself. Burns is Scotland as mountain, loch and moor can never be; he is Scotland incarnate in genius and character; Scotland, pathetic with the tragedy of hard conditions and stern toil and austere poverty; Scotland, victorious in the unbending will, the regal state of the unconquerable spirit, the power of second sight, the vision touching the rugged landscape of work and care with a beauty beyond that which sometimes makes those lowering western skies glorious as the gates of Heaven; Scotland, vital with the humor that springs out of the sense of man's blunders and trivialities against the background of his immortality—the laughter, born of faith and courage and tears, that has been the refuge of Scotland in many a tragic year.

Last summer, in a single week, several thousand people passed through Ayrshire; some of them idle and curious tourists; many of them drawn by the sense of kinship and gratitude that has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made Stratford dear to those who know the greatness of man and the pathos of his fortunes; that makes the Poet's Corner of Westminster as sacred as the altar; that keeps a fresh rose beside the bust of Longfellow; that renews perpetually the wreaths on the coffins of the two poets side by side in the Grand-Ducal vaults at Weimar.

Scotland owed Burns a debt that never can be paid; but how much he owed Scotland! He was born to a great heritage. The fibre of Scotch character—the character developed in a country where there is no servile class, no peasantry waiting hat in hand as the privileged pass by, no brood of beggars living on the dole of the fortunate; where, from the humblest firesides, the passion for learning sends an army of young barbarians, scornful of ease and enamoured of penury, to Glasgow and Aberdeen, to St. Andrews and Edinburgh—the fibre of Scotch character was his; and, before he wrote the song of modern democracy—the exultant chant of the man who counts because he is a man—Scotland had lived by that creed and died for it. Stern independence, lofty pride, dauntless courage—these were in the blood of the Scotch. They were often monarchists, they were never courtiers; they could die for their kings, but they could not bend the knee to them.

Rugged as their climate and soil made them, thrifty and laborious as stern conditions compelled them to be, standing century after century, sword in hand, with their backs to the wall, they were always lovers of poetry, dreamers of dreams, spinners of stories, children of romance, given to impossible loyalties and lost causes, frugally counting the cost to the utmost penny, and then casting prudence to the wind and putting the last penny to the hazard in some desperate idealism. This is the very stuff of poetry—heroic character and daring imagination, the warp and woof of the Scotch nature; stern as Knox, tender as Effie Deans. No one who has seen Scotland, who has looked at her rugged and often magnificent landscape, has failed to feel the invisible and brooding spirit that envelops that landscape like an atmosphere, and reveals its presence in a thousand humble ways.

A Scotch writer of distinction told me a few years ago that in the May of that season he had been in the Isle of Skye, where he had been known since childhood. As he walked one day up a path on the rugged coast he came to a little hut in which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lived an old Highlander; a man past eighty, who could neither read nor write, and had never been off the Island. The door stood open, and the little house was empty. Looking up the path, he saw the old man standing a little in advance, his head bowed and his bonnet in his hand. He hesitated a moment to speak to him; then, when the old Highlander raised his head, he said, "Sandy, I didn't interrupt you because I thought you might be at your devotions." "Well, not exactly that," was the answer, "I have come out here every morning for forty years and taken off my bonnet to the beauty of the world." In a country in which illiterate old men go out and bow to the splendor of the universe the poet and romancer are bound to appear.

Burns owes Scotland a great debt for his education. He is often classed with Shakespeare and Lincoln as an example of what the uneducated man can do; as if genius had no need of training. What is education? Is it a beaten highway, or is it any path that takes a man to the summit? Is it a system of study, or the enrichment of the spirit and the setting free of the personality? Is it discipline and knowledge, solely; or is it the awakening of the imagination, the creative faculty that has formulated the religions, and built the temples, and sung the songs, and written the poems, and discovered the continents, and ruled humanity not by the petty interests of the hour, but with that vision of the future which we call statesmanship? Education? Is it rule and measure; is it method and process; or is it the firing of a man's soul, the loosing of a man's hand, the invigorating of a man's will for the great adventure of life? Shakespeare was not immersed in the knowledge of the schools, but he was plunged headlong into the knowledge of life; Lincoln was, for his work, the best-trained American of his time. Burns, the greatest of song-writers, the most vivid, moving, heart-lightening, heart-breaking poet of the Scotch home, the Scotch fields, the Scotch rivers and the elemental passions asleep or stirring in the souls of men, had the best, because the most vital, education; and the only education that counts with a man of genius is that which vitalizes and inspires. Burns had three rare teachers: one, a country schoolmaster who taught him the only thing he needed to know by rule,—the meaning of words and how to make the simplest speech serve the highest uses of the imagination; another, the bonny Ayrshire lassie who was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his mother, who sowed by the way when the virgin soil lay open to every night of dew and every morning of light; who took him by the hand and led him to the greatest of his teachers—to Scotland waiting for her poet in the fairyland of legend, song and story. In the days when his imagination was opening to the wonder of life, she bathed him in the running streams of poesy that flowed from the deep places among the hills, and made the homes of labor and hardship beautiful as the flowers that are set in the little gardens; and, years after, when Burns fell on his knees in Dunfermline and kissed the spot where rests the heart of Bruce, he knelt at the innermost shrine of his education. He learned the songs of Scotland by heart, repeating them as he drove his plough or walked to his work; sounding their music to the depths and mastering their magic by the ear, which is the secret of his command of the poetry that sings. After a generation of teaching poetry by text-book, chart, blackboard, lecture and examination, we shall be compelled to go back to the training which the Greek boys got from their Homer; which Shakespeare received when England was a nest of singing birds; which came to Burns and Scott from the poetry floating like the clouds in the air above Scotland.

Suddenly, out of his obscure youth, the ploughman, born in a clay house on the road that runs from the Bridge of Doon to Ayr, emerged into fame; to touch the country about him, river and vale and village, with the light that gives immortality to all upon which it rests.

He was not to deal with the rich results of thought, as Tennyson did; nor with the free impulse of personality, daring to assert its right and use its power, as Browning did; nor was he to record the reaction of knowledge on faith, as Arnold did; his business lay with the human heart and its elemental passions, with the great strains of independence, self-reliance, indifference to badges of success and the insignia of place and power. It was his to render the landscape of Scotland with unrivalled power of truth and imagination, to fling wide the door to the Scotch fireside without violating its sanctities, to give the elemental passions a voice vibrant with pathos and mirth and tenderness, to strike the keynote of democracy with resonant and compelling authority.

He became a poet of the fireside and of the sturdy Scotch in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tegrity; the most intimate singer that Scotland has ever known, and the dearest; the most daring poet of manhood who has set the soul of democracy to music. He was strongest when he was dealing with the simplest human emotions in the simplest speech; his art was weak only when it yielded to the influence of sophisticated society. It was in the fields that he found the "wee, modest, crimson-tipped flower" and the "wee, sleekit, tim'rous beastie"; it was in the simplest homes that he saw the tender and beautiful drama of the family in the "Cotter's Saturday Night"; it was out of such homes that Mary Morrison and Highland Mary came; it was at the wayside inn, on the country road, and in the highway about the rural kirk that he found "Tam o' Shanter," "Holy Willie's Prayer," keen to the edge of irreverence with biting irony, the "Address to the Deil," the "Holy Fair"; it was out of the very heart of Scotland that "Auld Lang Syne," "John Anderson, my Jo," "Wert Thou in the Cauld Blast," and "A Man's a Man For a' That," issued like fresh streams from hidden springs.

Burns had great gifts: a striking personality; an imagination at once daring, graphic and poetical; a vigorous and powerful mind that in any field would have put him with the best; a rich, rollicking, audacious humor, one of the rarest and greatest of original endowments; a heart that knew all the depths of pathos, a hand that could touch all its keys, and a genius for using words as if he had made them. He had also the great gift of passion which is part of the creative impulse, though he suffered it too often to inflame rather than to inspire him. His, too, was a penetrating and destructive irony which gives "Holy Willie's Prayer" and the "Holy Fair" a quality of truth that seems to erode the metal and sink its lines into the plate like an acid. He had fidelity to life in details, and a wonderful freshness in giving detail life-likeness; he had the largeness and freedom of a powerful intellect, and the fierce and at times reckless energy of a great but imperfectly controlled personality.

When he sings the equality and dignity of man as a man, he strikes notes that have reverberated through the English-speaking world; when he sings of the sorrows and sweetness of the home and the tenderness akin to pain of love, he touches the sources of smiles and tears; when he gives free reign to his genius for touching life on the quick, to his rollicking and audacious

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

humor, and to his fresh and vivid diction, as in "Tam o' Shanter" and "The Jolly Beggars," he achieves, as Matthew Arnold said, "superb poetic success." But Burns is dearer to us most of all in "Auld Lang Syne," in "Duncan Gray," in "Whistle and I'll Come to You, my Lad," and a dozen other songs, compact of the stuff of poetry which, once heard, lingers in the ear and lives in the heart. His was a tenderness akin to tears; piercing pathos; sparkling wit; a manner at once intimate and masterful; a sense of human fate appealingly tragic or touched as by a wing astray from Heaven.

An awful catastrophe has blighted a section of Sicily; but Sicily lies forever smiling and secure in the verse of Theocritus; so simple, so rustic, so instinct with life. So Scotland lies beyond the touch of time and change in the songs of Burns. How deep are the roots of his art in the soil of life, how far below the surface lie the springs of his inspiration, how fresh and vital, how domestic and intimate, how tender and deep is the skill of the heart which has made Burns the best-loved poet of the race, and given his songs the sweetness and the sadness, the mirth and the pathos, of the meetings of lovers and the partings of friends the world over!

We have not forgotten his faults; they too are a part of his story, to be told and retold to the end of time; but how radiantly the light of his genius shines across the storm of his life, full of warning, full of splendor! Let them judge who will; we, at least, will stand silent in the presence of this tragic victory; this mortal infirmity rising to immortal achievement. In his memorable essay Carlyle wrote that the world is habitually unjust to its men of genius; it decides, like a court of law, by dead statutes, and not positively, but negatively, less on what is done right than what is or what is not done wrong. When two ships come to anchor,—one stained and battered and half dismantled, with broken spars and tattered sails, and the other clean and trim, with straight masts and white sails,—before you pass judgment find out what voyages they have made; one may have but crossed the harbor, and the other may have come round the world!*

HAMILTON WRIGHT MABIE.

* The substance of this article was delivered before the Burns Society of New York on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversay of the birth of Robert Burns.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POSITION OF WOMAN.—III.

EXPANDING ACTIVITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN AMERICA AND ENGLAND.

BY THE DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH.

A CERTAIN purposelessness and want of union have prevented woman achieving an equal place with man in activities of a commercial or political nature. Especially in the middle and upper classes, where woman's duties are reduced to overseeing, woman is in danger of becoming a more or less useless companion to man. And in the lower classes, where woman has been forced to seek work in the labor market of the world, what has she achieved there? Here her want of union, her inability to co-operate, have had even more disastrous results. The young girls dependent on their fathers, but anxious to earn a few shillings to enrich their wardrobes, the mothers pressed to increase the husband's meagre earnings in order to support a large family, have joined the great army of labor not on equal or even just terms. In eager haste and driving fear, they have sold their work at half its worth and in blind perversity hastened to undo their own ends by underselling man's work and lowering the standard of wages. When some of the more intelligent, realizing what they had done, tried to form trade-unions, they met with resistance and incapacity everywhere; and it was only by calling in man's aid and in many cases joining his unions that woman learned to protect her industrial value. Even now, how low it is rated notwithstanding that woman's work is, in trades and industries suited to a woman, quite as good as man's, if not better.

The first beginnings of Trade-Unionism among women in England took place in 1874, and the founder, Mrs. Emma Paterson, went to America and found out for herself how Women's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trade-Unions and Friendly Societies, already successfully started in that country, operated. She came back fully resolved to do something to improve the conditions under which women labored in her own country, and began by publishing a paper in the "Labor News." Before her death, in 1886, she had succeeded in firmly establishing the principle that woman must unite to protect their interests, and in placing this truth on the practical foundation of Trade-Unionism. It still remains a problem how to induce women to fight for their rights. They have been in a subservient and irresponsible position for so long that they have come to accept whatever is sent them with a philosophical calm and lethargic indifference almost impossible to rouse. The writer has herself visited Clubs in the East End of London, composed of girls working in factories, where they earned a miserable pittance and worked from eight to twelve hours a day. When she tried to impress on them that these were not fit conditions for their acceptance, and that their Club should become a co-operative union to resist unjust terms, instead of being merely a social centre, they smiled hopelessly as if at some wild but yet pleasant fancy and returned to the dreary monotony of things as they were and would to them remain. It takes something more than mere environment to account for such hopelessness; it is hereditary, instinctive and unreasoned. We have seen to some extent the primary causes that account for woman's lack of initiative outside her home; we have seen her more and more confined to her activities by man's assumption of labor and control; we have watched her outbreaks of energy, always occurring when a freer education had stimulated her moral activities, or man had tried to withhold a prerogative she had learned to enjoy. We have noticed that she has not been slow to avail herself of moments of confusion, or movements heralding reform, to press her own cause. We know also that the present time is one of unequalled activity among women, that in science, law, metaphysics, medicine, industry, political economy and politics, women are rising to the foremost ranks. More especially in England, where women outnumber men by the terrible majority of a million and a half, do we find the fight for political franchise and the assertion of equality it implicates at its height. Here women are at last uniting in one great determined body to insist upon the completion of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that long march towards the gates of freedom begun by women insidiously, furtively, individually at first, but now in a body, openly, courageously and like men. It is because womanly measures have failed to open the gates that they have resorted to more masculine ones. Not because they enjoy going to prison or making themselves objectionable, but because they know that no great reform has ever been brought about without public agitation of a more or less aggressive character on the part of those directly concerned.

If you have a sore and hide it, you are not likely to be admitted into a hospital; if you have a grievance and do not ventilate it, you are not likely to meet with redress. What type of woman is it that furnishes these would-be reformers? Is it the lower class—patient, hard-working, almost mechanical in its suffering and endurance? No, for they have not the time to spare, nor the imagination to appreciate the rights that some day will accrue to them. Is it the upper class, wasteful of opportunity, contented in their surroundings and but half-awake to the great purpose, passing it by? No, for they are too fearful of the world's reprobation, too satisfied with their own conditions and too engrossed in self-culture and self-ease to do more than discuss the probability of eventual success or failure. And so, unlike the Roman matrons of patrician descent, it is not England's aristocracy that claims a senate, or the right to vote. It is indicative of the times and the nation's thought that it is the great class of intelligent, independent and successful earners of salaries who are leading this movement—women who have entered into dignified professions, who are leading honorable lives, independent and self-supporting, women who are householders and taxpayers, and whose eminent capability and judgment render them efficient controllers of the right of citizenship. These are the women who are suffering imprisonment and ridicule for the sake of a right they deem in justice due, not only to themselves, but to the great class of struggling, suffering, unvoiced womanhood, too weak to cry out, too downtrodden to rebel, too uneducated to understand, but not too insensitive to suffer. For those women now crowding the public houses to find forgetfulness in drink; for those women condemned to a vicious, shameless life; for those underpaid, underfed, overworked, that congest the labor market and undersell their work; for those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unprotected, uncared for, degraded and abused—those are the ones they go to prison for, that their legislation as women for women may some day redeem their unfortunate sisters. And thus it would seem that the responsibility of work had wakened in woman a purpose and an incentive not known to her more indolent sister.

Turned from the adventitious character of the pretty proselyte whose unavowed object is no other than marriage and whose purpose in life ends with marriage, the serious woman has established a goal less personal and less selfish. Not that we would decry marriage as a laudable and commendable goal; but life does not end with its attainment as fairy-tales would make us believe. Woman's real life and purpose more often begin after marriage than before, and it is the choice of such an aim that this article would wish to stimulate. Domestic requirements no longer sufficiently employ either the modern woman's time or her intellect. We are now speaking of the woman who has servants to accomplish what in former days used to be her duty. Neither do children fill up her leisure. Public and private schools, governesses and tutors, have taken away one of woman's most sacred duties. She can still supervise her household and the education of her children, giving that *coup d'œil de maître* and bestowing the mother's influence none other can equal; but her time is not filled, and failing a more serious interest, a fussy attention to small details will monopolize her mind. And this is what many brilliant women are apt to degenerate into from lack of opportunity and purpose. In England, where class obligations exist and women have been brought up with a sense of responsibility towards society, the duties imposed upon her are of a various nature. There are, in the first place, the responsibilities incumbent upon the chatelaine of a country place, remnants of feudal obligations.

Her duties are many and varied, from the distribution of blankets and coal in winter to the entertainment of school children in summer. Again, she is the natural head of all the village organizations, the club-rooms, nursing association, beekeeping society, flower-shows, etc. If endowed with the ability to organize she will probably play a leading part in the charitable enterprises of her county. She will have to attend and preside at numberless meetings, flower-shows and bazars, visit hospitals and workhouses, care for the poor and destitute, and get to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

know every one, and his and her wants individually, and may still incur the gentle rebuke of an old blind widow, "You have not been to read to me for a long time, and I have missed you sadly." Perhaps a rebuke, and yet what a gracious compliment! With an education such as this, it is readily understood that an English girl brought up in her country home must have some conception of what duty to her neighbor means, and if she does not live up to it an attendant unpopularity will be hers.

In London itself, the requirements are less direct, but political leagues, charitable associations, hospital committees and the hundred and one appeals continually launched for financial aid and personal influence give every one a chance of serving public utility. The wife of a Member of Parliament is expected to discharge all sorts of duties, political, charitable and ornamental, for the constituency regard her as their own bright star and bottle-washer combined. Of late years, the fashion for women to speak when presiding at bazars, prize-givings and political functions, has become general, and a woman who declines to "say a few words" is looked upon as depriving the audience of a right of criticism which is now part of the day's amusement.

Debating societies, lectures on "how to take the chair," "the tricks to avoid when speaking," "what not to do with your hands when on your feet," have become part of the curriculum of the woman of the world. Women's clubs, political leagues, debates, lectures, fill many a day. Many women have a pet charity or institution dependent on their exertions, and that takes time and thought to keep it going. In fact, a woman who wishes to find an outlet for her energies enjoys every opportunity; the only danger is that she may take up too many interests, so that with multiplied and divergent claims she may be unable to further any one in particular. Again, a real objective must be kept in view, and the interests most adapted to her position or individual capacity should be the ones to command her attention. It is just as needful for a society woman to specialize in her interests as it is for a woman practising a profession to confine herself to its scope. In these days of specialized effort, one cannot be a Jill of all trades nor a finished performer on more than one instrument. One can, of a truth, be the patroness of all good objects, or the patron saint of all virtuose talent,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but this is at the best a negative function, and unless individual effort and thought are put into every scheme or work, it counts for little in the end.

The difference in the field of activities of an American compared to that of an English woman are thus very marked at the outset. In England, the channels of activity were dug centuries ago, and the course of time has but broadened their bed. If with the expanding sphere of woman's influence new tributaries are flowing into these channels along with the old ones, they all trace back to the same source—woman's willingness to co-operate with man in sharing the responsibilities as well as the benefits organization confers. Man has trained woman in the older country, and if she is now outstripping the limitation he has marked for her, it is because the time is ripe for her to conquer new territories. Woman's political activity is but an outcome and a corollary to the problems of industrial competition she has had to encounter, and an adjustment to the new activities her economic position as an independent wage-earner has insured. With her independence have come new liabilities, with her liabilities the desire for equal protection—a protection that can only be secured by a voice in the Government she helps to maintain. There is no doubt that questions affecting her immediate surroundings are best left in her hands. In primitive times, woman, as we have seen, controlled all domestic questions. Thus questions of sanitation affecting food-supplies, milk, water, drains and ventilation, questions concerning the education of children, their employment in factories, the regulations regarding the employment of women, the administration of relief to the poor, would be better and more effectively dealt with by women than by men. And in time such matters will no doubt be controlled by boards composed of women. Practice is, however, necessary before execution, and all women would do well to prepare themselvs for this eventuality.

In America we have the advantage, as well as the drawback, that accompanies the absence of the well-marked rut of precedent. Here Society can recognize its own obligations and launch into fields of endeavor, not wider, perhaps, but capable of more scientific treatment, of more economical efficiency and of yielding more practical results. Unhampered by conservatism and prejudice, practical philanthropy is walking hand in hand with applied

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

science, and woman's sphere of utility attains undreamed-of proportions. There has never been a time when the State was more willing to help private endeavor of a philanthropic nature; is not this also a door to more intimate knowledge with those departments of public affairs woman will in time want to control? Besides the great philanthropic work open to woman in America, there is the province of politics which she has not yet touched. Her reasons for abstaining from contaminating herself with anything so sordid have been amply demonstrated, and there is no doubt that to a certain extent the element of the so-called professional politician has been a deterrent to her influence. But woman's office is to elevate—her presence to purify—and the day is not far distant when woman's influence in politics will be wanted. The selfish boss, possessing unlimited power and recognizing no responsibility; the wire-pullers, unscrupulous because of their unknown identity; the political scavengers that haunt every office—all will in time recede before the true and self-respecting representatives of the people. With the election of disinterested and scrupulous men to the minor legislative bodies the people will resume the control and direction of their own affairs, and it is for woman to help to bring about such a result. Woman's influence must first find its way through indirect channels. Merely to encourage husband or brother to enter the political arena is the first step. The second comes almost naturally—to go to his meetings, to help him in his campaign; to interest oneself in his business and in the welfare of the thousands of employees he may have working in his factories; to provide clubs for them, and reading-rooms; to have meetings of a social nature for their wives where politics will gradually come to be discussed in the proper spirit and in the right light. All this done as a friend, not as an interloper or generous patroness, tends to create the good feeling between employer and employed that should by right exist if each is doing his best. Many tell one that such a course in America is impossible, that the men are too independent and would resent interference. But if made in the right way, men do not resent, but welcome, any effiort on the part of the employer, animated by the feeling of brotherhood, to get into touch with their point of view. The socialistic fallacy dinned into their ears that what is good for the employer is bad for them, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vice versa, must succumb before such direct appeal. There are certain public duties belonging to every position in life, and the mere fact of citizenship holds a responsibility for every unit in the State which it should be his pride to discharge. Women are citizens too, and if they aspire to the privileges the status confers they must learn to live up to its responsibilities. If such views were held by the rich as well as by those numbers of women who so willingly work in the service of the State, arraignments malicious, unjust and libellous such as are written against society now would lose every little semblance of verity they possess. Mr. Upton Sinclair could no longer wield the stinging lash of his rather meretricious invective, nor vaunt his never-failing panacea of socialism. Here is an opportunity for American women to win the praise their intelligence and ability have so often called forth. There is every sign that at the present moment a disintegrating force is at work undermining public confidence and frightening the lethargy of those who seemed secure. Whatever this force may spring from, its presence cannot be ignored, and is a danger to the community unless directed into channels of systematized reform. It is useless to meet a great problem with hasty and ill-prepared mind, it is equally futile to stem a steady current with a dam whose foundation is not solid. The socialist propaganda has been called to life in a large measure by the neglect of some of those who occupy prominent positions to recognize the tremendous responsibility that wealth has placed on their shoulders. Unscrupulous platform orators and writers have held these up to public scorn, neglecting to mention the good deeds of those whose conscience is proportionate to their means.

There is no doubt that to administer charities successfully so as to create the greatest preponderance of utility is a difficult task and one worthy of the consideration of the soundest and most capable brains. There is also no doubt that the responsibilities of great wealth are often puzzling, discouraging and strenuous. But the work of administering a fortune fairly in providing for personal requirements and in furthering reproductive schemes, is one of intense interest, and one that may well fall to the women in America, where men leave so much of the distribution of wealth in their hands.

It is an administration which demands the closest personal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attention in order to succeed in its aim. The mere fact of handing $100,000 to an institution does not constitute a recognition of such a responsibility. It is, on the contrary, an open invitation to others to accept that responsibility. The writer believes that specialized effort should be woman's purpose, and that, in thus advancing socialism in its most favorable aspect she would create an ideal worthy of a unity of purpose—the socialistic ideal being for every member of the community to have a given task and an appointed place in the working of the great state machinery. That this task should be suitable to the individual's mental and physical capacity is their contention. Why should not women then take this ideal and make it their purpose in life? Motherhood, as we have seen, covers but a small period of a woman's existence. There are, therefore, many hours spent in futile endeavors to make the time pass, in self-culture, sports, frivolities, psychological experiences, often dangerous and exhaustive, and much money, time and energy is spent in rounds of expensive and luxurious entertaining, that leave her empty and disheartened at the end. Why not live life scientifically, the best suited for the given task? And by the best suited is not only meant the most mentally gifted, but the best suited in position, opportunity, wealth and capabilities—in fact, the socialist ideal personally adapted and lived up to. When a woman has to work for her living, she naturally adapts herself to her environment and calls out whatever strain in her own nature most readily responds to it, and then chooses a profession and mode of life accordingly. The writer's point is that women who are not obliged to work for a living should work in one way or another, either politically, artistically or philanthropically, but always personally, with the avowed purpose of living up to the responsibility fate has imposed upon them. We have seen how, without purpose, the women of the past grew disorganized and lost all aim in life, drifting into that adventitious position that prevents the accomplishment of any real reform. Let women, therefore, unite in purpose, and let their purpose be the recognition of those higher responsibilities we owe the State, so that when the time of realization dawns we may not be unprepared to accept those duties and cares the rights of citizenship will involve.

CONSUELO MARLBOROUGH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERMANY IN TRANSITION.

BY ANGLO-AMERICAN.

THERE is no European nation that has altered within a single generation in so many essential qualities as Germany. With the visible tokens of her development every one is familiar. A congeries of petty, disjointed, quarrelsome, half-moribund States was welded thirty-eight years ago by the interdependent processes of war, diplomacy and spoliation into a powerful and united Empire. The white heat of that superb achievement seems to have transmitted itself through every vein and to each extremity of the body politic. The impulse it generated has electrified every form of national endeavor. From St. Petersburg to London the world of European politics, if it does not to-day, as two years ago it unquestionably did, wait expectant upon the German lead, at least revolves, and not always of its own free will, around the German centre. When the Wilhelmstrasse intervenes in any question, that question acquires at once a new seriousness, and the cleverness with which most of Germany's moves are calculated, the suspicions and to a very large extent the ignorance that surround her policy, and the formidable power she can always summon to enforce her decrees, invest her every action with a far-reaching anxiety. The Kaiser holds a position of actual and potential power almost Napoleonic in its range and effectiveness. He is the head of the greatest and most scientific army in Europe and perhaps in the world. His navy is an instrument of admirable potency, fashioned with the microscopic carefulness that in 1870 made Germany invincible on land. He is bidding with unexampled boldness, and, what is far more pertinent, with unexampled success for that dual supremacy of military and naval power which all the authorities have told us is beyond the material competency of any one nation. The State organization

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at his disposal is assuredly the most efficient and the most intelligent in Europe. Nor is it only in administrative perfection and material resources that the Kaiser is strong. He is strong, too, in the character and qualities of the people over whom he rules, a virile, supremely capable nation, thrilled with the consciousness of being on the crest of the rising wave and looking forward to the future with an almost defiant assurance of success. Sixty-two million Germans, organized into a State that lies round the very heart of Europe, are not, unless the world has egregiously misread them, the people to feed or flatter the complacent opinion that the epic phases of history are over and done with and that all national ambitions on the old devastating scale have exhausted themselves. Putting the Japanese on one side, of whom I cannot speak from personal knowledge, I should say that no more thorough, energetic and disciplined nation exists on this earth to-day.

How have unity, prosperity and Imperialism, which have so suddenly descended upon a country devoted to plain living and high thinking, affected its spirit, its moral fibre, its conception of life? That there has been a change and a deep one the very stones of Berlin cry aloud. The great city on the banks of the Spree, a generation ago little more than a placid village, is to-day a strident metropolis, whose whole style of existence marks the vastness of the distance that Germany has travelled in the last forty years. There may be plenty of high thinking done in the capital—done by men whose salaries, worldliness and activities make the old type of German professor seem an impossible anachronism—but it is certainly no longer a city of conspicuously plain living. The rents are such as to open even a Londoner's eyes, household expenses are proportionately severe, and the clubs, the theatres and, above all, the hotels and restaurants, point in a direction that does not lead by any means to economy. There are hotels to-day in Berlin that are little, if at all, behind the best of those in New York. True, they are not built for, and possibly are not greatly patronized by, the Berliners themselves, to whom the café is still the choicest and most popular resort, but their mere presence suggests an emphatic change from the old ways. Berlin is as much an affair of our own time as Chicago. Its past is so overlaid by the raucous and insistent present that the most pertinacious search can hardly disinter it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or the most visualizing imagination recall it. It is a triumph of mechanics and little more. One feels the lack of a background; one is conscious of no historical evolution. True, the labor of building it has been far more dexterously hidden than is the case with most American cities. It escapes the deadly uniformity, the prosaic rectangular precision, the dreadful air of having been hit off at a stroke and dumped down by contract, that characterize New York. The streets have curves, are spacious, shaded with avenues of trees, faultlessly asphalted, and clean with a cleanliness surpassing that of Paris. The white buildings, the crystalline air, the uniforms and the eternal salute, the overwhelming intonations of a planned, ordered, thought-out scheme, combine to produce an effect of which I can say no more and no less than that it is handsome. The architecture, to be sure, is riotously, exuberantly florid, but, for all that, a drive from the Unter den Linden to Charlottenburg will take one past a succession of finer, or at any rate more imposing, houses than either London or New York can show in such serried profusion. As for the official architecture, it is under the Kaiser's personal and directing patronage and therefore beyond criticism. But if Berlin just rises above imparting to one the American impression of a gigantic counter, it fails altogether to convey the London or Parisian effect of cosmopolitanism. The essence of cosmopolitanism I take to be a mellow something in the social air, a spreading spirit of the tolerance that comes from experience, of easy-goingness, of assured standards, of wide and quiet intellectual interests. But that is anything but the "note" of Berlin, where Court and officialdom only serve to put a little gilding on a life full of crudeness and materialism, where the military caste dominates everything, where society is furiously, spitefully sectional, and where, except for a bounteous supply of cheap and good music, there is hardly anything to alleviate the stridency of a rather mean and arrogant utilitarianism. Berlin, if not cosmopolitan in itself, stands near enough to the cosmopolitan whirlpool to be sprayed by the scum. It flaunts a coarseness of depravity that is not, I think, equalled anywhere. Pornographic literature of the most revolting and debasing character is becoming there as great an evil as it ever was in Paris. In no European capital do the standards in matters of taste and art and the minor embellishments of life rule so low. Berlin is a parvenu city, given

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over to money-getting, "pleasure," extravagance and officialdom.

In these and many other ways the new Berlin symbolizes, though in an exaggerated form, the new Germany, a Germany that has turned her back on much that was once her chief glory to plunge after material and convertible success. There has been a change of national front, a revolution and a lowering of the national ideals. That intellectual cosmopolitanism which used to be one of the most admirable and seductive of German traits has vanished along with the dazzling succession of authors, scientists and philosophers who were its embodiment and the unworldly professors who fostered and perpetuated it. There is little "heat of pale-mouthed prophet dreaming" in the Germany of to-day. The idealism and love of science and knowledge for their own sakes that marked the *ante-bellum* generation and constituted the nation's high, austere and distinctive claim to honor and influence, have been replaced by a bald and repellent utilitarianism. A new luxury, restlessness, discontent and chauvinism have invaded all classes. Modern Germany, pursuing wealth with an almost American ardor, has cultivated with assiduity and not without success the amenities and what Burke called "the solemn plausibilities" of life, has become more polished, more ceremonious, more preoccupied with the small niceties and embellishments of social intercourse; but has lost, or is rapidly losing, the old simplicity and purity of manners. The fact and the significance of this transformation are the themes of ceaseless threnodies in Germany herself and the starting-point of nearly all the innumerable foreign writers who have made her evolution their study. The latest of them, Mr. W. H. Dawson, says:

"A new spirit has entered into the national life. If the first half of the nineteenth century witnessed in Germany the reign of spirit, of ideas, the second half witnessed the reign of matter, of things, and it is this latter sovereignty which is supreme to-day. A century ago Germany was poor in substance but rich in ideals; to-day it is rich in substance, but the old ideals, or at least the old idealism, has gone. . . . For the present the assertion of modern Germanism is the assertion of material force, and it remains yet to be seen whether behind that assertion of force there is a spiritual influence that will permeate society and so become a permanent factor in civilization. We know what old Germany gave to the world, and for the gift the world will ever be grateful;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we do not know what modern Germany, the Germany of the overflowing barns and the full argosies, has to offer beyond its materialistic science and its merchandise, or whether the later gift will be of a kind to call for either thankfulness or admiration."

Given the external revolution — the mastery of the German Confederation, the war with France and the unity of the Empire—the internal revolution had, of course, to come if what had been won was to be held, developed and made the jumping-off ground for future triumphs. It is the Zeitgeist that is answerable for it at least as much as the German people. One may lament the completeness of the supersession of the old Germany, but it is more instructive to trace out its symptoms and consequences. They are sufficiently abundant, and I do not aim at enumerating more than a few of them. Education, to begin with, has been thoroughly materialized. A hundred years ago speculative philosophy and the humanities were in the ascendant; to-day their place is taken by natural science bound to the service of commerce and the "practical" professions. The hope of a harmonious balance between the economic and the moral side of German development is being steadily sacrificed. "A great number of students at German universities," says Professor Friedrich Paulsen, "no longer come in contact with philosophy at all, and a deplorable lack of familiarity with the ultimate problems of existence and life is, accordingly, to be found amongst the educated classes, even amongst those who have received an academical education. Vague scepticism, materialism of the most superficial description, eclecticism void of any philosophical principles, uncritical submission to every latest craze in the garb of philosophy—these are the consequences of the disappearance of philosophy and its clarifying influence from the school." And they in their turn encourage the subordination of everything to the knowledge that pays; encourage, too, a flightiness and superficiality of mind that threatens the overthrow of the traditional German culture. Mr. Wolf von Schierbrand even declares that from a pre-eminently reading nation the Germans are becoming the very reverse. "Whole strata of German society," he says, "have begun to affect, or to really feel, a deep contempt for books, for book learning and for all that books can teach." His volume, "Germany," bears repeated witness to the effects upon the German people of their rush into city life just at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a time when they are losing their spiritual faith in theories of moral restraint. Crimes against property and morality have multiplied in Germany in the last thirty years with an appalling rapidity, and financial juggleries have kept pace with them. It is becoming increasingly difficult to find men who will enter the Church. Even the Government service barely holds its own against the attractions and rewards of a commercial career. The best business brains of the country are no longer to be found in the bureaucracy. "Men of wealth now occupy a different position in popular estimation from that formerly held. The German public is as much interested in their millionaires and industrial dynasties as Americans are in theirs. Luxury is everywhere apparent—in the stores and shops, in the display of fine clothes and jewelry, at social gatherings, in the appointments of houses, exteriorly and interiorly. Fine palaces are reared by the wealthy merchants and manufacturers in the large cities and towns, and beautiful country residences in the fashionable suburbs, with spacious grounds adjoining." Prince Bülow recently lamented the disappearance of the old German frugality:

"I will speak plainly—I say that we are living in an age of luxury, and in an age which overrates the value and importance of material enjoyment, which must inspire with serious anxiety every one of us who has at heart the true civilization of the mind and spirit of the nation, which is its highest welfare. All of us must in all respects return to a more economical mode of life and to a greater simplicity. Yes, all of us; I make no exception. Simplicity of life is more honorable and more meritorious, and it suits us Germans of all nations better than the life we are now leading."

Among the tokens that are calculated, in the Chancellor's words, to inspire "serious anxiety," is the fact, always an unhealthy fact, that the marriage age among the higher classes grows later and later. The number of unmarried women of a marriageable age—estimated at considerably over two millions—and the great increase in divorces emphasize a growing social unsoundness; and the many scandals of recent years among the aristocracy, which is always and in all countries the first class to show the taint of corruption, point to an unmistakable decline in the standards of national morals. The revelations of the successive trials that sprang from Herr Harden's attacks upon the court camarilla were symptoms—extreme and untypical symp-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toms, it is true, but still symptoms—of a real and pervasive deterioration. In a vivid and brilliant, almost too brilliant, chapter in his book on "England and Germany," Mr. Austin Harrison has tracked the flood of German materialism through a multitude of channels, and is undoubtedly right in finding in it the real driving power and the special characteristic of practically all German activity in practically all spheres of work and thought. "For the time being," he says, "it has paralyzed the simple and contemplative life of Old Germany, and driven the fine arts and the finer shades of thought and life into the cobwebbed corners of antiquity. With the exception of the Catholic population, I imagine Germany to be the most free-thinking nation on religious matters in all Europe, and the country certainly containing the smallest number of churches and ecclesiastical dignitaries. . . . The whole tenor of German life, from one of sentiment and idealism, has become engrained with materialism, scepticism and what may be termed selfish and national actualities. Germans are the most matter-of-fact, candid, fact-seeking people now living, perhaps the most coarse living, certainly the most material thinking and acting; and this itching love of knowing and discovering is discernible not only in life and act and conversation, but is reflected in art, on the stage, in music, in literature and in religion, and finds expression in perverse curiosity."

In nothing, perhaps, is the change from the old to the new in Germany more manifest than in the revolution which has overtaken the position and outlook of women. The days of their subjection are drawing rapidly to an end, though to an Englishman or an American, conscious of his own and of all masculine demerits, their submissiveness in their home life is still almost an embarrassment. But after a terrific struggle they have carried their claim to a full educational equality with men; they have forced a way into many professions and trades hitherto barred to them; they overrun the lower grades of the Government and municipal service; and they are yearly making themselves more felt on social and political questions. In a country where there are more women than men, and over two million spinsters, the hearth and home theory of the scope of feminine interests and activities was bound sooner or later to break down. The Kaiser when he declared that Church, kitchen and children were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the woman's true sphere summed up the views of the average German man. The German woman, compelled thereto, in the first instance, by sheer economic necessity, thinks otherwise. The modern Gretchen refuses to be "the aproned caterpillar of man." She has her own clubs, her own vocations, her own life and individuality, and she insists on making the most of them. Mrs. Alfred Sidgwick, the author of that eminently wise, witty and revealing book, "Home Life in Germany"—the best book on German life that has yet been written in the English language—warns us not to take the emancipated *Backfisch* too seriously or to regard her as typical of all German women. But she is at least a new and very interesting phenomenon. The woman movement in Germany, indeed, probably as the result of long centuries of feminine suppression, is in some directions more "advanced" than in any other country; and its literature suggests anything but a trammelled and conventional view of life and of women's place in it. Mrs. Sidgwick says:

"It makes one open one's eyes to go to Germany to-day with one's old-fashioned ideas of the German Frau, and hear what she is doing in her desire to reform society and inaugurate a new code of morals. She does not even wait till she is married to speak with authority. On the contrary, she says that marriage is degrading, and that temporary unions are more to the honor and profit of women. . . . A German lady of wide views and worldly knowledge told me a girl had lately sent her a little volume of original poems that she could only describe as unfit for publication; yet she knew the girl and thought her a harmless creature. She was presumably a goose who wanted to cackle in chorus. . . . One of these immoderates, on the authority of Plato, recommended at a public meeting that girls should do gymnastics unclothed. Some of them are men-haters, some in the interests of their sex are all for free love. None of them accept the domination of men in theory, so I think that the facts of life in their own country must often be unpleasantly forced on them. I discussed the movement, which is a marked one in Germany at present, with two women whose experience and good sense made their opinion valuable. But they did not agree. One said that the excesses of these people were the outcome of long repression and would wear out in time. The other thought the movement would go on and grow; which was as much as to say she thought the old morals were dead. Undoubtedly they are dead in some sets in Germany to-day. You hear of girls of good family who have asserted their 'right to motherhood' without marriage; and you hear of other girls who refuse to marry because they will not make vows or accept conditions they consider humiliating. These views do not attract large numbers; probably never will. But they are sufficiently wide-spread to express

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves in many modern essays, novels and pamphlets, and even to support several magazines."

There can be no question that the *Backfisch* of to-day who reads Maupassant, Gautier, Nietzsche and what not, who has seen "Salome" as a play and heard "Salome" as an opera, who regards Shaw's "Mrs. Warren's Profession" and Wedekind's "Spring's Awakening" as improving as well as "psychologically interesting" productions, and who looks back upon Gretchen, in Mr. Austin Harrison's words, "as we look back on the fainting virgins of the Early Victorian era," is an altogether novel development. I do not exaggerate her importance or believe very strongly in her permanence, any more than I regard the curious and painful epidemic of suicides among German children as a normal and static feature of German evolution. These and all the other phenomena on which I have touched are the tokens, no doubt, of a change which is also a descent. But to talk of the Germans as decadent is ridiculous to those who know them. No decadent people has ever increased at the rate of a million souls a year while at the same time reducing the rate of mortality. The foundations and structure of the nation are still in the main sound, though not so sound as they were, and German life and character still retain most of their old vigorous purity, hardihood and placidity. In applied intelligence, in discipline, concentration, the capacity for taking pains and research, the Germans are still the foremost of living peoples. But there has been a change and a change that in spite of periodic reactions will certainly continue. The age of German Stoicism has passed; that of German Epicureanism has begun. We may, and probably shall, see before long a healthy revulsion, a revival of the pristine spirituality, an effort of the Grecian side of Germany to assert itself against the predominance of the Roman side. Meanwhile Germany continues in a phase, a disquieting and unpleasant phase, of social and moral transition.

But it is not alone in the sphere of social life and morals that an observer comes across the signs of a sweeping revolution. Looked at broadly, Germany is seen to be trying to solve three distinct but intimately related problems. The first is to become a great naval, commercial and colonial Power. The second is to adjust her domestic policy to the fact that every year finds her passing more and more decidedly from a mainly agricultural to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a mainly industrial State. The third is to establish a working compromise between universal suffrage on the one hand and the fact, in recent months the somewhat glaring fact, of semi-autocratic, personal rulership on the other. Of these three problems the first may be said to be in a fair way to solution. That is to say, all Germany and all the responsible and effective parties in Germany have now set the seal of national approval upon the policy of Imperialism in all its many forms. In the *bloc,* for instance, which at present supports Prince Bülow there are Agrarians and Protectionists, Free-Traders and Free-thinkers, Tories and Radicals. They differ on more than one point of domestic policy, but on the question of *Weltpolitik* they are substantially at one, the Radicals supporting a big Navy, an overpowering Army and colonial expansion as heartily as the Conservatives or the National Liberals or the Kaiser himself. The Social Democrats alone consistently oppose the gospel of Imperialism, but their opposition is largely a matter of form and accident; their power is for the moment in eclipse, and will never, in my judgment, be strong enough to restrain the deep-seated instinct towards naval, colonial and commercial Empire. For all practical purposes the ideal of a Greater Germany and of the manifold activities and ambitions it comprises must now be accepted as imbedded in the will and consciousness of the German people. In little more than a generation world-wide interests have been enrolled among the intimate concerns of a people that, except intellectually, used rarely to look beyond its own borders. That Germany has quite accommodated herself spiritually to the greatness of her new position it would be too much to say. The "touchiness," the self-assertion and the grotesque habit of suspiciousness which all too frequently mark the temper of the German people in their international dealings are the tokens of a certain immaturity, of a latent discomfort and overconsciousness in the wearing of the purple of Empire. The Germans have not yet quite reached the point of taking their importance for granted. They have not yet quite outgrown the puerile propensity to call attention to their new dignities and strength with an emphasis sometimes boisterous and not infrequently offensive. That, too, is a sign of transition.

The second of the three problems I have mentioned—that of devising an equitable, political and economic balance between the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests of industry and of agriculture—is one that grows in contentiousness with every year that passes. It is over a decade and a half since Caprivi declared that Germany was "no longer an agricultural, but an industrial State." The fact was scarcely arguable even then; it is indisputable now; and with her increasing population, her growing dependence upon foreign food-supplies, and her vast expansion of manufactures, it will soon be accepted by all Germany as axiomatic. But it is a fact which the organized obstinacy of the Agrarians has hitherto kept from any adequate translation into terms of politics. A new economic order has arisen, but the policy of the State has not yet been adjusted to it. Preponderantly industrial as she is, Germany is still for the greater part ruled in the interests of agriculture; and to reduce the ascendancy of the Agrarians to legitimate proportions is one of the most anxious tasks that lie ahead of the country. A great and complex fight is on for the control of Germany's economic development, and it is in that light that the present crisis in the Imperial finances and the measures proposed for its solution take on their true significance. From 1879 till to-day it is the Agrarians who have really dictated the fiscal policy of the Empire. It was they who overthrew Caprivi. It was their Bourse law of 1896, forbidding all dealings in "futures" of whatever kind—a law recently modified to permit of transactions in futures of mining and industrial stocks, but not in corn or mill products—that has been one of the chief causes of the exodus of German capital, the high German bank rate and the instability of the German money market. Every commercial treaty they have fought and whittled down with all the weapons of political terrorism. It was their opposition that defeated the great schemes of canal development, just as it was their pressure that led to the restrictions upon the importation of live-stock, the premiums granted to sugar-producers, and the progressive increase in the corn duties. They have, in short, pursued their own interests with a total blindness to the interests of all other classes and with a success that will come to be looked back upon as one of the miracles of modern politics. The measure of German discontent, of class bitterness and of the growth of Social Democracy is very largely the measure of Agrarian ascendancy. They have been able so far to hold their own and to impose their wishes on Chancellor after Chancellor because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the immense desirability in all countries, but in a military country especially, of keeping the peasantry on the soil; because of the many strong links of social and political sympathy that have always united the nobility and the Crown; and because the Conservatives and the Agrarians were for a long while the only, or at least the most conspicuous, advocates of naval and colonial expansion. They sought and achieved Protection through Imperialism; the tariff was their stipulated reward for subscribing to *Weltpolitik*. Now, however, that Imperialism has ceased to be a Tory and Agrarian monopoly, the struggle between the industrial and the land-owning interests is destined to develop a yet sharper intensity. On its issue will largely depend whether the German invasion of foreign markets is to expand or contract.

With the final token of the present transitional stage in Germany's development—the gathering resolve to shackle the personal régime, to make Government responsible as well as representative, and to do away with the obsolete electoral system that in Prussia both stifles and perverts the popular will—I have left myself little space to deal. Liberalism in Germany is gaining ground year by year, but whether the people as a whole are as yet really desirous of Parliamentary Government or sufficiently experienced to work it is another and more doubtful question. We must remember that politically the Germans are still in the pupil stage, that the German lines of division are social rather than political, and that while they may chafe under the abuses or blunders of the personal régime any concrete proposal to abolish it, to curtail the Constitutional prerogatives of the Crown, and to make Ministers responsible to the Reichstag instead of to the Emperor would rouse immense and, in my belief, decisive opposition. Nevertheless, the trend of the German mind is unquestionably in the direction of giving the people an increasingly effective control over national and Imperial policy, and of modifying the present system of one-man power, if not by direct enactment, then by one of those tacit compromises and informal understandings that regulate the workings of British Constitutionalism. Some day the issue between Crown and People will be definitely joined. So far it has been merely broached. But that it should be raised at all is, perhaps, the most interesting fact about Germany in transition.

ANGLO-AMERICAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION.

BY HAROLD E. GORST.

EVERY day the subject of education is attracting more attention. We have at last reached the point, in the history of modern civilization, where it has become alarmingly apparent, at least to a few of us, that something is vitally wrong with the whole system of educating young people and developing their faculties. The failure lies glaringly before our eyes; but, with the extraordinary blindness of human beings, the vast majority of us have never, for a moment, connected cause with effect. We have seen ourselves surrounded by social evils of the most harmful character, and have hitherto been contented to regard them as inevitable features of modern life, due to the ordinary stress of circumstances. Some of us, however—unhappily, yet but a small minority—are awakening to the fact that the trouble is deep-seated; that it lies, not with the common economic factors of our daily existence, such as overcrowding, competition, degeneration and so forth, but with some fundamental fallacy by which the normal development and progress of the human race is impeded.

What is this fallacy? I claim no novelty for the discovery that it is absolutely and entirely concerned with the fact that the youth of the nation, here and elsewhere, is being educated upon a general principle which is not only bad in theory, but little short of ruinous in practice. How this absurd theory of education has managed to survive for centuries upon centuries I will not stop to inquire. The probability is that it is because its pernicious results have been confined, in the past, to a comparatively small minority. It is only within the last two generations that it has been expanded into a practically universal system, applicable to the entire population; and, therefore, the acute evil of its effects has just commenced to manifest itself to an appreciable extent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All the ancient schools of which anything is known, from those in India and Egypt down to those at Athens and Rome, were conducted upon the same principle of instructing in accordance with a cast-iron programme of knowledge to be instilled by force of discipline. The traditional method was handed on to the church schools of the Middle Ages, to the Latin schools which developed from them, and to the schools of to-day, which, in the majority of cases, have been modelled upon the latter. Nobody—except a few isolated reformers working in obscure corners of the Old and New Worlds—seems to have dreamed of questioning, much less of challenging, the soundness of this crude and antiquated theory of education. Once a thing has been systematized and officially organized into a permanent social institution, the independent thinker who grasps its imperfections and enormities finds himself not only coming into violent conflict with the compact mass of tradition-bound, blind and interested units that go to form this system, but running into a stone wall of public credulity rooted in prejudice.

Let there be no misunderstanding on this point. A stupendous array of educational zeal has been directed, all the world over, for the last quarter of a century or more, towards extending and improving the school system. Millions upon millions have been wasted upon every conceivable kind of educational endowment. In England, in particular, large sums of money have been expended, almost lavished, upon equipping the elementary schools with the most varied and complicated apparatus that human ingenuity could devise, with the result that the financial burden imposed upon the British rate-payer is beginning slowly to goad him on to some feeble and vague protest on the score of expense. Training colleges for teachers have sprung up on all sides like mushrooms, letting loose upon the educational world an army of instructors drilled, in the most efficient way, to persuade children, as gently and firmly as possible, into the educational strait-waistcoat. All this has happened within our own knowledge, and is going on now—with ever-increasing zeal, amounting almost to delirium—under our noses and to the tune of a swelling chorus of public eulogy.

But nobody has come boldly forward to challenge the principle upon which this modern educational energy is going to work. The principle has been tacitly accepted by the vast majority of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people. It has even, apparently, been taken on trust by the army of misguided philanthropists who have been vying with one another, of late years, in pouring wealth into every crevice of the whole field of education. I do not deny for a moment, therefore, that the school and college system is developing and growing by leaps and bounds. All I desire to do is to warn the public that this educational ferment must not, on any account, be confounded with genuine reform. Far from this being the case, it is a dangerous and pernicious, although well-intentioned, bolstering up and multiplication of one of the greatest factors for active evil by which the world has ever been cursed.

Although the United States and Great Britain have fundamentally the same education system, the schools and colleges of the two countries differ sufficiently, in some respects, to necessitate a brief comparative survey before examining the problem at close quarters. In the first place, the American system is far more efficiently organized than the English system. It is no idle boast that a direct path has been provided, in the former, from the gutter to the University. But education in England is still in a hopeless muddle. The elementary schools are confused and unsettled; they overlap in the most wasteful way; and there is no road, except by way of scholarships for the privileged few, to higher education. Consequently, the children of the working-classes, in England, are turned adrift at the age of fourteen, fitted for nothing, and without individuality, initiative or the smallest realization of aptitude for anything in particular. The thoroughly efficient organization of education in the United States, coupled with the fact that the child of the poorest laborer can get a free education right through to the age of eighteen, proves, on the other hand, how high a value the American people set upon the advantages of a school and college training; and how ready they are to support and foster any institution which they believe to be in the interests of the nation and of the individual.

English and American universities differ mainly in spirit. They are all of them fit for little else than the turning out of a rather useless type of scholar; but the University authorities in the United States appear at least to be fully alive to the fact that practical and business life demands another type of man. Realizing this, they are constantly experimenting in the hope of hitting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon a method of training and supplying the right article. This is, at any rate, laudable. It shows that a most valuable spirit has crept into higher education on this side of the Atlantic, and that American citizens are too practical a people to ignore the fact that their system is faulty and that it contains, somewhere or other, some grave blunder. As nobody in England, except those directly concerned in educational work, takes the slightest interest in the problem of education, it is quite clear that reform, when it comes there, will have to come from within. The outlook in the United States, judging from all I have previously read and heard, as well as from my own brief experience in the country, is much more hopeful. Reform in the right direction may not only be generated within the inner circle of educationists—some of whom, I can affirm from my own knowledge, are at least partly aware of the evils of the present system—but will eventually be insisted upon from without. Whatever defects Americans may have as citizens—on that point I am wholly uninformed—they certainly display the most intense and practical interest in educational matters; they realize, as British parents do not appear to realize, that the education of their children, on right lines, is a thing of paramount importance. Some of them may be blind believers in the present system; but there is every indication that the majority are by no means disposed to take its perfection for granted. The average American is not only a practical, but also an elastic-minded, man. He is not wedded eternally to theories, and he believes only half what he sees. And besides this, there is a factor in the situation which must not be overlooked: The American woman is full of intellectual unrest. She wants to learn, and she cares nothing for accepted theories or antiquated traditions. So she is an individual to be reckoned with in the future; for the mother who takes an intelligent interest in the education of her children, and who applies her thinking powers without prejudice to the problem, will bring a new and powerful element into the question which nobody can afford to ignore.

Those who want to judge of the value of modern methods of education must judge by their results. It is no good looking at the aims and professions of the schools and colleges themselves. The whole social organization of Western civilization teems with anomalies, injustices and inequalities. Let them be examined im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partially, and the intelligent observer will not be slow to comprehend how many of these evils are attributable, in the first instance, to the constant suppression of individuality by the education system. How many individuals, to begin with, have discovered their precise vocation to lie in the work they are compelled to do in order to earn their daily bread? The percentage of happy, contented people who are doing, consciously, just what they are fitted for is notoriously small. Is there a single person, possessing a tolerably wide circle of acquaintance, who cannot point to dozens of examples of individuals that are leading wasted and disappointed lives through pursuing an uncongenial occupation? There are writers, thinkers, artists and musicians eating their hearts out in Wall Street; there are engineers in the pulpit or driving street-cars; naturalists and farmers slaving away at figures in a counting-house; scholars masquerading as administrators; and men of action, the would-be pioneers of new and productive industries, bound hand and foot in some office of law or commerce. It is a pitiful story, the first chapter of which commenced in the elementary school. And it is something worse than cruelty to the individual. It is the canker which produces national inefficiency and national decay, and which multiplies mediocrity in every profession and occupation throughout the length and breadth of the land. A well-known Philadelphia professor testified publicly in my hearing, a few weeks ago, to the high percentage of men in technical colleges who were compelled to give up their course, because it was discovered, at the eleventh hour, that they had no aptitude for the vocation for which they were being trained.

That is the human side of this manufacture of mediocrity and wholesale misplacing of individuals. Now turn to the economic side. Is it not courting disaster to produce, year in year out, masses of men fitted with precisely the same mental equipment? Everybody recognizes the unhappy results of an excessive supply of labor in the industrial market; but nobody has pointed out the equally disastrous effect of an oversupply of University graduates, all equipped with the same ornamental, useless and half-baked literary accomplishments. The United States has escaped the worst economic evils that result from this practice of turning out uniformity from all the centres of education. But this is merely due to the circumstance that America is still a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

young country of boundless resources and opportunity. The evil is there, nevertheless, slowly eating its way into the heart of the nation. In an old country like England, the appalling economic results of this incessant supply of machine-made scholars are only too apparent. Briefless barristers, literary hacks, broken-down University men, starving clergymen, doctors without patients, critics in garrets and ragged philosophers are as common there as pebbles on the seashore. People allude to them, with a shrug of the shoulders, as life's necessary failures, and are too lazy or too unobservant to attribute such an every-day feature of modern civilization to any traceable cause. Yet even the educational authorities themselves sometimes catch a glimmer of the truth. The Chancellor of an Irish University remarked, last October, in the course of an address to the students:

"One of the gravest dangers that can come upon any country is the existence of a large number of highly educated young men, who have no immediate or graduated outlet for their talents. It is wicked to give a man the highest education, and simply turn him loose on the world, and there is no necessity for this indignity. In any well-ordered country, such as Belgium or Germany, there are Government or private schemes which take up the scholar when he is leaving the University, and usher him onward into the line or path he may desire to tread. The whole tendency of life is now for men to take up special lines, electricity, engineering, medicine, industries, commerce, and to follow up that work from the earliest moment and progressively. Specialism is one of the greatest products of the day. What I say is required now is special work and special training."

There is yet another side to this problem of academic education, and that is the physiological. The whole plan of forcing a general education upon everybody—whether it be classical, mathematical or anything else in character—necessitates the cramming of the mind with facts, with ready-made opinions, with other people's ideas and borrowed reflections. This process of cramming is not a natural but an artificial process; and on this account—quite apart from the badness of its educational principle—it is actually injurious to the brain. This is no mere assertion on the part of a layman. Probably but few people have not come in contact with cases of mental breakdown through overwork in connection with scholarships, the passing of degrees, examinations and so forth. A system of mental training which threatens injury, even in a remote degree, to the brain, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

particularly to the brain of the most intellectually gifted, can hardly claim to be regarded as the right method of mental development. The best mental specialists in England are, at any rate, far from satisfied that education is being conducted on sound lines. When I occupied the position of private secretary to the English Minister of Education, a few years ago, I made inquiries on this point. Amongst other communications, I received replies from our two greatest experts on mental breakdown: Dr. Savage and Professor Maudsley. Their letters are a valuable and significant comment on our present methods of education, both elementary and academic, and I therefore print them in full.

Dr. Savage says:

"I now write in answer to your letter as to the evil effect of cramming and overeducation, as far as my experience is concerned. First of all, I must say that the cases in which pure and simple overworking an otherwise healthy subject produces mental illness are very few. First, the nervous boy or girl is often unusually bright and forward, and therefore is likely to be encouraged to do more than is good for him. Next, the general health of the child makes an enormous difference to the amount of work which may be overwork. I believe most harm occurs in forcing promising children; next, in forcing children who are not properly fed.

"I think that the strain of classics has produced more cases of breakdown than that of mathematics. But there it is rather rash to draw hasty conclusions, for accident may have brought more Oxford than Cambridge men under my notice. But my present impression is that the training to produce a Balliol scholar is a dangerous one. If the child is forced to take exercise, harm may be avoided. But here again, the boy certainly who is likely to suffer from work is the boy who avoids games. I find it difficult to provide the particular instances you need. I think every large public school produces boys of the following type: weakly, not given to games, with feeble digestion and weak circulation. They read and work very hard for scholarships; they are allowed, in some schools, to sit up at night almost to any hour they please. They have insufficient food, and their work is too much along one line.

"It may be necessary to cultivate a classical or a mathematical ability specially; but it is always associated with danger in the boy who is gifted."

Professor Maudsley, dealing with elementary education, writes:

"I am sorry that I am unable to give you the practical assistance which you require. I keep no notes of cases which come under my observation. The school-board system of cramming with smatterings, instead of teaching their victims to think—even if only by teaching one subject well—is perhaps responsible for some positive mental break-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down; but probably the main harm of it is that it stifles and strangles proper mental development. The vigorous brain of the healthy child suffers the cramming and forgets it; the dull and stupid brain protects itself by its stupidity; it is perhaps only the weak and sensitive brain of the neurotic child which, taking the inanities of school boards seriously, is actually broken down or permanently hurt. Undeveloped mentality is perhaps the principal fault of our educational system (so called)."

My indictment against the elementary school system—that is to say, the system of giving a general education to the children of the nation—contains three more serious counts to which attention may be specially drawn. In the first place, it practises a heartless deception upon the great mass of the people, who, in their ignorance, put a blind faith in the practical value of the training which the schools purport to give. They believe that their children are being endowed with indispensable knowledge, which will qualify them for superior situations and enable them to rise in life. It is a pathetic belief. The least critical person, gifted with ordinary intelligence, knows perfectly well how far removed it is from actuality. The elementary schools do not fit the children for any practical purpose whatever. Their net result is, on the contrary, to unfit them for the realities which they have to face when they find themselves compelled to earn their own bread. Large numbers of these victims, sharing the delusion of their parents, misjudge their educational qualifications. They are led in this way to despise honest labor, and even to look down upon the craftsmanship of the skilled artisan as being inferior to the mechanical occupation of a clerk or drudge, because the latter enables them to become a shabby imitation of the classes above them.

Then there is the undoubted fact — borne out by criminal records—that an unsuitable education often lies at the root of vice and dishonesty. There can hardly be a doubt that the present education system helps to manufacture criminals. In my official capacity at the English Board of Education, I corresponded, on this subject, with the chaplains of our principal prisons, and the answers received to the inquiries made left no doubt in my mind as to the pernicious results of a superficial general education upon certain classes of the community. Here are some significant extracts from a letter, written to the Minister of Education, in England, by one of these prison chaplains:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"My own opinion with regard to the present system of education is that it is liable to foster conceit, discontent, a disinclination to submit to discipline and authority, and a dangerous phase of ambition—which are fruitful sources of that kind of crime which is in these days most prevalent. A smattering of every kind of scientific information creates an intellectual dyspepsia, which makes life unwholesome in its source and action. It is surprising that, in these days of specialists, young people are not thoroughly taught the things which are needful for some definite pursuit in life. This superficial education causes, I think, self-deceit as well as self-conceit. It leads young people, in their desire to rise in the social scale, to attempt by dishonest methods to raise the means to live at a higher rate than is justifiable, to gamble and speculate, in order to keep up a false position.

"I have come across those who have fallen, where this has been admittedly the case; and who have lamented that such wrong ideas had been put into their heads. Young people now look upon many honorable and useful employments as beneath them; and there is a general rush for those which seem to offer a better social position. I am afraid much of this is due to the mistakes made in their early education."

The third count applies more generally to England than to the United States, although it is a pressing social problem in all large industrial centres where there is a poor and ignorant population. It lays to the charge of the elementary school system responsibility for the destruction of human life on a large scale. In London, New York and other great cities, the attention of the authorities has frequently been drawn to the alarming proportion that infant mortality bears to the general death-rate. A high percentage of this mortality is directly due to the ignorance of the mothers concerning the feeding and care of their infants. The President of the Obstetrical Society in London, in giving evidence before a Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the subject of physical deterioration in Great Britain, stated that eighty-five per cent. of children were born physically healthy whatever the condition of the mother might be antecedently. Nature, he declared, intended all to have a fair start. And an array of eminent medical witnesses testified to the ignorance of the parents on the question of feeding infants. It is surely a bitter satire on our system of educating girls that, as soon as they become mothers, their homes have to be invaded by health visitors and tract-distributors in order that they may be taught the A B C of their domestic duties. The education system must therefore be held liable, so long as it neglects to give girls a prac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tical training in this respect, for that large proportion of infant mortality which is due to the ignorance of the mothers.

Many charges might be preferred against the present education system; but at the bottom of them all lies the fundamental error that individuality is forcibly repressed by it; that everybody is manufactured to the same pattern, and that in the process of manufacture hereditary talents and individual traits are smothered by the perpetual heaping of knowledge on to the mind. The thing is so plain, so obvious and self-evident, that it is simply amazing to reflect how not only generations of scholars and pedants, but also generations of practical, active-minded men, should have continued unquestioningly to keep it going with their approval and support. Everybody has evidence of the crushing effect of modern education upon the mind and character right under his nose. Children, before they are sent to school, increase in the joy of life, in productive activity, in powers of observation, and in the passion for investigation, every day of their existence. From the moment they enter the schoolroom all is changed. The joy, the activity, the thirst for knowledge and inquiry—all are gone in the briefest possible period. From moving about, and from using his hands in obedience to an irresistible creative impulse, the child passes into a new and unreal world where he is compelled to sit still, and where, instead of investigating for himself, dull and prosaic facts are driven methodically into his mind. The imagination, just about to expand under the influences of natural development, contracts and withers; the brain is first dulled and then forced; the productive activity—except in a few experimental schools which have been established here and there in the face of public prejudice — is rigorously stamped out of existence altogether.

This criminal method of educating the young will, in the natural sequence of human progress, be revolutionized. The longer the revolution is put off the worse for the human race. Evolution has taught us that the use of faculties cannot be discontinued with impunity. The laws of nature are inexorable on this point; and when a muscle, or a bone, or a sense, or an individual trait remains unemployed, it fails to develop and ultimately disappears. Our education system neglects to cultivate the faculties with which a child has been specially endowed; it does not even make an attempt to discover what they are. People say that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

education on such a plan would be too expensive; it would involve, they imagine, a teacher for every child. So it is generally accepted that the next best thing is to fix a standard of general knowledge, and drill it into the entire rising generation. It saves trouble and expense; and it has behind it, furthermore, the advantage of centuries of tradition. The consequences of this neglect cannot fail to react upon future generations. The faculties which education not only leaves undeveloped, but actually suppresses by forcing the mind into stereotyped channels, must tend, in the natural order of things, to die out. Therefore, hereditary talent and individuality will gradually be dissipated; with the result that the future race, weakened intellectually and even in a measure physically, will sink lower and lower in the scale of mediocrity and uniformity.

Enlightened educators, in all civilized countries, are beginning to realize the gravity of this danger, and are taking venturesome steps—undeterred by opposition and ridicule—to arrest its progress. Germany is already the field of experiment in this direction. Some of her best men have grasped the fact that, although Germany is ahead of all other nations in the successful manufacture of capable mediocrity, she is only succeeding, by her superiority in this respect, in bringing about the more rapidly the destruction of the finest intellectual material—inventive, creative, administrative and progressive — in the German nation. In Munich, and possibly elsewhere, the most splendid institutions have been founded, experimentally, for the discovery and development of individual tendency. Their success, in a practical country like Germany, may any day change the face of education as carried on there in the public schools and colleges. The idea has been caught up, to a certain extent, by English educationists working obscurely in holes and corners of the English school system; but even the strongest and most determined Minister of Education in England would find it almost impossible, in the compass of his brief five or six years of administration, to overcome the obstacles to reform ceaselessly placed in his way by the most obstinately conservative permanent officials in the English public service.

The United States is teeming with the spirit which should give the keenest impetus to an educational revolution of an intensely sane and practical character. Reformers on the right lines

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are busily at work in the great cities of the New World, as elsewhere. What clogs their efforts is, no doubt, the prosperity and progress achieved hitherto, in spite of the detrimental influences of modern education. Enthusiastic American citizens—I have met them by the score—are too ready to attribute their virtues and achievements to the free education for which universal provision has been made, and to the work accomplished by schools and colleges of every type. This natural admiration for a really efficiently organized system of education (regarded merely as a "system") might well prove, eventually, to be the undoing of the American nation. But, if I understand anything of the American character, it will be discarded, fast enough, when once a doubt enters the mind of the people. The Americans are not tradition-bound like the inhabitants of the Old World. They are unsentimentally practical, almost to a fault. If education be found to be wanting, if it be proved to have been based on a false principle, it will be revolutionized in the United States by the irresistible pressure of public opinion.

In what direction will this revolution be pointed? As far as I comprehend the work which the most enlightened reformers are advocating and carrying on, in various countries, the ultimate revolution will be directed towards overturning the whole plan of giving, in the first instance, a general education. How far it may be realized, by these reformers, that a general education is in itself a pernicious thing, I do not pretend to know. The majority of them seem to have gone to work upon the assumption, not that the inculcation of a stereotyped quantity of facts destroys individuality and imagination, but that the hands should be trained as well as the mind. Following this path, they are stumbling gradually upon the truth; but although improvement will result from their methods, salvation must be sought upon far more drastic and revolutionary lines.

Training the hands, side by side with destroying the individual mind, is only a half measure. It is a praiseworthy endeavor to mitigate the evils of the present education system; but it can do no more than mitigate. The real problem is to preserve and to foster natural tendency and individual talent. Manual training may help a little in this direction, although its efforts are rendered largely abortive in proportion as they are made subsidiary to the cramming of the mind with general knowledge.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But it fails as a method of remedying present evils, because it does not perform the first essential duty of all genuine education: the setting itself, in a direct and scientific way, to discover the individual bent of each child.

There is only one practicable method by which this first and paramount object of education can be achieved. Children must not be sent to elementary schools to be taught, without any preliminary investigation into their capabilities and tendencies, the knowledge which is supposed to be essential to the average member of the community. These schools have cost the country hundreds, perhaps thousands, of millions. It cannot be helped; but, the sooner they are pulled down, the better for the interests of the nation. However excellent the teaching, these schools are hotbeds for the wholesale destruction of the individuality upon which the future might and greatness of the nation is dependent. They are worse than useless, unless they can be rebuilt to fulfil the requirements of a new kind of institution — conceived on a far broader basis, both constructively and educationally—in which the sound principles of a genuine education can be carried into effect. For it is not in schools of the existing type that measures can be taken to study the individual bent of the child. This can only be done by the provision, within the dimensions of one great institution, of such scope for individual capacity as would cover the whole range of productive activity. There must be workshops of various kinds, laboratories, kitchens, gardens, and, where practicable, even a farm. Every broad sphere of activity will have, as far as possible, to be represented. The children will thus be turned loose into a real world, full of interest, where they will not be subjected to mental and physical repression, and where their tastes will have full opportunity to develop and reveal themselves. Placed under skilled direction, it would not be difficult, in the course of a comparatively brief period, to ascertain, broadly, the capabilities of each child.

A certain percentage would doubtless display a natural inclination towards a purely literary training; but the vast majority, showing capacity for more practical and active spheres, would eventually have to be drafted off into schools of a new type, according to their individual necessities. These institutions would divide themselves naturally into broad, distinctive groups, each group containing its own complement of schools and colleges.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For instance, one group might embrace scholarship and scientific research; a second, engineering and other mechanical occupations; a third, art and the decorative trades; a fourth, farming and agriculture; a fifth, industry, commerce and finance; and so on. Every normal child would be found to belong, by predisposition, to some broad sphere of activity. It would therefore be the duty of the educators, in the great selecting institutions, first to discover the individual bent of the child, and then to recommend to the parents the course of special training to which he ought to be subjected. Probably enough, many existing technical colleges and other educational establishments would, with certain modifications, be readily adaptable to the giving of this special training, divided, as suggested above, into broad, distinctive groups.

I have only endeavored to give a rough indication of the lines upon which, in my belief, the impending educational revolution will be carried out. Its most significant and inevitable feature, I am convinced, will be the abolition and destruction of all elementary schools, and the substitution, in their place, of such institutions — workshops rather than schoolhouses — as I have sketched out, for the purpose of discovering and encouraging individual capability. It is only by such means that degeneration can be arrested; and that a strong and healthy nation can be built up, capable of achieving and sustaining a foremost place, both intellectually, morally and industrially, in the civilized world of the future.

HAROLD E. GORST.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONALISM IN MUSIC.

BY REGINALD DE KOVEN.

It is a fact, as well known as it is to be regretted, that, in Music alone of all the arts and sciences, no American so far, with the possible exception of McDowell, has struck that dominating note of supreme mastership which compels unquestioned and universal recognition. In painting, in sculpture and in architecture; in poetry and in general literature in all its varying and varied moods and modes of expression, Americans have won an entrance into the inner shrine of fame, and occupied high places in the assembly of the great ones of the earth.

While it is admitted that Music is the last art to develop in any civilization, it must also be admitted that our civilization and general culture have reached a point which would predicate a degree of development in Music commensurate with our progress in other and kindred fields of creative activity.

To find any one able or willing to set a definite bound or limit to our national possibilities of artistic achievement in any given direction, in view of existing national artistic accomplishment, would, I think, be difficult. Hence, it must be possible to adduce good and sufficient reasons for the existing conditions which it is the purpose of this article to consider, and for which, having once assigned an intelligible cause, it may also be possible to point out a remedy. In the consideration of this subject from every varying standpoint, I would advance the opinion, as practically axiomatic, that, given a demand, the supply will in due course necessarily follow; and that opportunity makes the man more often than man the opportunity. In apt illustration of the above, it may be observed that the French Opéra Comique, an institution which has perhaps done more for Music as an art than any other similar institution in the world's his-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory, was not created by the school of composers which has given it glory, but was itself the creator of that school.

The causes, as I see them, which may reasonably be held responsible for the lack of creative musical productiveness that gives to America as a music-producing nation a position inferior to all other civilized countries, are twofold—first, those superficial causes which are readily recognizable by almost any one as determining; and, second, those more subtle and underlying causes which penetrate to and affect the very soul and origin of Music as an art, in its less readily appreciable relations to the minds and hearts, and purely æsthetic feelings, of mankind.

Foremost among the first, I would place what is a distinctive and perhaps racial tendency—that easy adaptability which, together with a high degree of restless, nervous impatience, is perhaps the most salient characteristic of the American people to-day. As a nation, we are only too prone to race to a desired result with seven-league boots of impatience, which so hurriedly cross the intermediate stages as to render mature and rounded achievement, founded on the solid structure of logical training and development, in most cases an impossibility.

Again, the development of Music in this country has had to contend with a decided and wide-spread inclination among our solid men to consider the study of Music as an art both trivial and unworthy. This is one of the legacies left us by those good old stiff-necked Puritans whose influence still obtains and crops up in most unexpected quarters; those sturdy forefathers of ours who looked upon Music in any form as a bedevilment and invention of the Evil One, a foe alike to piety, morality and good manners. It was not so long ago that, even in England, a man who studied Music, or played upon a stringed instrument, was referred to slightingly and with disparagement as a "Fiddler"; and it was a translation of this feeling into this country which prompted the remark made to me some years ago by a gentleman, a leader of the Bar, and representing the literary culture of his important community, that "any man who devoted any attention to Music was little better than a fool." The tendency inevitable in a new country, where the commercial spirit is the controlling agent of progress, to measure artistic work solely by a financial standard of value has also been a hindrance to the development of our artistic possibilities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another readily intelligible reason for our lack of musical productiveness, hitherto, may well lie in the fact that America is only beginning to develop a leisure class. The hurry and bustle, the ceaseless activity and strenuous energy of our every-day life, have left us little time for meditation, contemplation or the development and cultivation of the higher emotions. Music is the natural expression, the wordless language, of a part of our being, which our universal business and commercial pursuits have not only failed to foster, but of necessity have retarded and kept in the background. The marked development of musical taste among the general public during the last ten years has gone hand in hand with the formation of a leisure class among us. We must have leisure before we can enjoy; for intelligent enjoyment, properly speaking, belongs to the legitimate exercise of our higher faculties.

Again, the profession of Music is not as a rule a lucrative one. The musician looking towards fame, and towards the development of his highest artistic possibilities, is lucky indeed who makes a bare living. Art is a hard and jealous mistress, and requires of us our supreme energy and most arduous toil for the production of just those artistic results which are likely to secure the smallest meed of public appreciation, and therefore the least material compensation; in other words, the maximum of creative energy for the minimum of financial return. Therefore the desire for wealth, that unending strenuous chase after the almighty dollar which is a national characteristic, prevents many a man possessing the natural talents and aptitude from cultivating an art which in all probability would advance his material interests so little, and thus forms another and most potent cause for our tardy development in an art which is, beyond doubt or question, the most refining, cultivating and civilizing influence in any community.

Another important and self-evident cause is the fact that, until very recently, it has been almost, if not quite, impossible for any one aspiring to musical proficiency to obtain the necessary education and training in this country. What facilities for musical education we have hitherto enjoyed have been for the most part of the wrong kind, and such training as could be obtained was both unsystematic and superficial. As a case in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point, and of personal knowledge, I may state that, in a reputable well-known so-called "College of Music" in a large city (both of which shall be nameless), a gentleman was permitted to teach singing and the rudiments of harmony, whose only musical training had been a course of six months' instruction in the same institution. What artistic results could be expected from such a system? Like instances might be multiplied throughout the length and breadth of this great country, where musical instruction (falsely so-called) is too often incompetent and through misleading pretence often dishonest.

Another determining cause of existing conditions which must not be overlooked or underestimated in its effects, has been the lack of the musical atmosphere to create and stimulate musical thought, so necessary to the cultivation and artistic advancement of the musical student. The absence in this country of such an atmosphere—alone created by opportunities for constant hearing of the best music of all kinds at reasonable prices—has sent our would-be musicians abroad, where such opportunities are readily obtainable, in ever-increasing numbers. Having thus been obliged to go elsewhere for what has been hitherto unattainable here, our foreign-trained musicians have naturally and unavoidably in their musical expression been, for the greater part, a reflection of the environment in which their artistic training has been gained; and this evident tendency brings us naturally to the underlying causes above mentioned, to which, in my judgment, more than to anything else, the existing lack of distinctive national musical creativeness is due.

National music has been defined as that music which, appertaining to a nation or tribe whose individual emotions and passions it expresses, exhibits certain peculiarities more or less characteristic, which distinguish it from the music of any other nation or tribe. To such music the Germans very appropriately give the designation of "*Volksmusik,*" which term, for present purposes I think, it may be permissible to render into English as "Folk-Music." The absolute lack in American music, so-called, of the characteristic peculiarities which would give to the expression of thought or character in music anything distinctive or national, is to me the principal underlying cause for the tardy development of our musical creative ability, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the absence of general recognition for the American composer.

Music to be great, and universally recognized as such, must in a sense be national; and the history of the art shows that the best music has been written in those countries where the greatest amount of national feeling prevails. It is now pretty generally admitted that the Anglo-Saxon race is not markedly musical in its tendencies, and thus far the predominating race-type in this country has been the Anglo-Saxon. This is fast disappearing, and we are beginning to feel the effect of the enormous immigration of the last half-century, and the infusion into the original American stock of the blood of European nations.

The American people is now; the American Nation is yet to be.

Until we shall finally and once for all have done away with the hyphenated nationalities, and the consequently divided national feeling, which still exert an important influence on our musical life, we cannot expect to have a national feeling which in expression shall be distinctively American and recognizable as such.

Further than this, until this feeling is generated by the slow process of national assimilation and progress, we can hardly hope for that distinctive school of music which is the prime essential to our national musical development. Whoever it was that said, "Let me write the songs of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws," enunciated a truth having to do with the effect of distinctively national music upon a nation or people, whose importance can hardly be overlooked. The popular airs of a nation might well be called the almost unconscious soul utterances of the people. They grow, they develop—how, one hardly knows; for, as some one aptly remarked, "Really popular melodies compose themselves." Their very existence in many instances is due to some great national crisis, to some wave of national feeling or emotion. At times, they emerge from the fiery crucible of a nation's anguish; at other times, the irrepressible outburst of a nation's joy gives them birth. As an evidence of the non-productive effect, from a musical standpoint, of a divided national feeling, it may be said that the agitated passions and emotions of the Civil War brought into existence a number of melodies and popular songs, which, from their melodic contents,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might well rank with many of the most characteristic folk-songs and popular airs of foreign nations; and yet none of these songs were taken permanently to the hearts of the people, and almost all have disappeared with the memories of that great conflict. Possibly, some other great national crisis is needed to weld the American people into a Nation upon which a united national feeling could be indelibly stamped, and thus become productive of lasting musical result.

It is a curious fact that no great national music has ever been written among a people living under a republican form of government. The Swiss are, perhaps, the oldest example of a people living permanently under that régime, and there has never been a Swiss composer of any note or of even moderate ability. Against this it may be urged that the American Democracy is unquestionably *sui generis;* that nothing like it has ever existed before; and that for this reason, being in a position to make precedent for ourselves, we need not necessarily consider Democracy *per se* as inimical to musical development. On the contrary, the very variety of the elements which are now forming the American nation would argue in favor of the possibility of the foundation of a National School of Music, which, in uniting the characteristics of many peoples, might in time develop into something broader and stronger, fresher, more vital and more spontaneous than anything the world has hitherto seen. As a people to-day we have an eminently original, inventive and constructive faculty; and, when the rapid civilizing and developing processes which we are now undergoing shall have given us more leisure, and shall have broadened our perceptions to the extent of enabling us to see in the cultivation of the arts, and more particularly of the art of Music, one of the noblest fields for the exercise of human energy, we may reasonably expect to see the American composer take a place in the world of music more in keeping with the existing development of the country in other fields of artistic effort.

But the question of the progress and development of music in this country naturally and immediately suggests the necessity of the foundation of the National School of Music above mentioned. Admitting this, the further question at once arises, What should be the basis and foundation of such a school?

If it be true, as has been said, that the best music has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

written in those countries where the greatest amount of national feeling prevails, it might be claimed that the necessary foundations of this school should be those popular airs or folk-tunes which, to a certain extent, form the basis of the so-called national music of Europe; and the question may be argued *pro* and *con* as to whether such music is the necessary basis of a national school, or whether this folk-music, which ordinarily comes to us from a past so remote that its primary origin is practically undiscoverable, is an effect or cause of national feeling. I am inclined to believe that folk-music may, at one and the same time, be both an effect and a cause.

That united national feeling which we as a country are yet too young to have developed, which in times of national joy or grief finds a spontaneous expression in music, either as an accompaniment to appropriate words, or as an expression of thought beyond the power of language, must first exist before the lasting foundations of a distinctive national school of music can be laid. Otherwise, we should have had such a school in America long ago; for, as has been often observed, there is in this country an almost inexhaustible fund of folk-music of the most varied kind—the Negro, Indian and Creole—on which the American composer could have drawn had he been so minded. That he has not done so more generally would seem to indicate that neither to the composer, nor to the public to whom his work is addressed, does this music in any way represent or suggest a feeling that would inspire or attract because of any inherent properties of appropriate national application which it possesses. In the rare instances where composers have sought inspiration in music of this kind, like McDowell's "Indian Suite" or Dvorák's "New World" symphony, their music has not appealed to Americans as representatively national, nor been taken to their hearts as such, for the reason that all such tunes and melodies are really exotic and in no sense indigenous. If we admit that this folk-music, characteristic and original as it is, should be taken as the proper basis of a national school of music, we must also be prepared to admit that the Indian, the Negro and the Creole are the dominant race-types of America, which is absurd. Far more am I inclined to look to the popular tunes of to-day, however deficient in intrinsic musical value, which are being sung familiarly by hundreds of thousands of people, as a possible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foundation for a school of music expressive of national thought and character and appealing as such to the Nation, than to these Creole, Negro or Indian melodies, indicative only of the emotions and sentiment of alien races which have had little or nothing to do with our national upbuilding, and are now fast disappearing.

I do not mean to infer that, because the folk-music to be found in this country may not be thought properly available as the basis of a national school of music, the careful study of it might not be advantageous to the American composer and music student. The great variety of rhythm and modulation which it contains affords an inexhaustible source of useful suggestion; while, from the deep and beautiful expression contained in many of the melodies, they may be profitably followed as excellent models in composition. The chief advantage, however, in the study of folk-music lies in the fact that such music is in most cases what music primarily always should be—a faithful expression of feeling. The professional musician has many inducements to compose music which he does not really feel; and therefore a familiarity with national or folk-music in which absolute truth of expression predominates cannot fail to be beneficial to him.

The example of almost all the great composers who have made use of national or folk melodies, either by introducing them bodily into their works, or by adopting their salient characteristics, can well be heeded in this respect; and the many instances where such folk-music has had a definite and direct influence on the style and the form of melodic expression of the composers employing it may be taken as proof that such music may justly be looked upon as a cause rather than an effect of national feeling musically expressed. The famous composer, Grieg, furnishes a striking example of how the use of characteristic national melodies may affect and even completely alter a composer's style. Had he not intentionally abandoned his former German manner, and so imbued himself with the form and spirit of the folk-music of his own country, Grieg could never have attained his present rank as a distinctively individual and original composer. But the fact must be insisted on that the melodies which he made use of bore the impress of an already existing national character and feeling, both definite and unmistakable, and that music of this class has not as yet been a possibility in America,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because the concrete well-defined national feeling to produce it has not been present.

It may well be, as observed above, that the gradual unification into a nation of the various foreign elements which now constitute the American people, may in time produce an undivided national feeling definite enough to find a spontaneous expression in that folk-music which, as in Grieg's case, could show definite result in the upbuilding of a composer whose work might be deemed characteristically national. The very existence in this country of the differing taste in music inevitable to our various hyphenated nationalities, must be held to be another underlying cause for the backwardness of our musical development, as having to do with those foreign influences which so strongly affect our musical life, much, as I believe, to its detriment. With German-Americans clamoring for German music; with Italian-Americans demanding only Italian music to the extent of refusing even to listen to music of the French school; and with Americans of all kinds apparently willing to sanction and give heed to only such music as is European, it is perhaps a little difficult to know where the audience to stimulate the activity of the American composer by a willingness to listen to what he has to say musically may be found.

In this connection, I would quote from a recent article in the "Review of Reviews" by Mr. Arthur Farwell, an American composer who has done much to encourage native musical activity, who, in speaking of the estimation in which the American composer is held by his countrymen and the difficulty experienced by Americans in obtaining a hearing in their own country, says:

> "Artists with rare exceptions will not learn and perform American works, however high may be their opinion of them, in a society which still really sanctions only that which is European. Here was another intolerable condition. A changed social attitude is necessary. There must be wide-spread and organized performance of American works, before the country has at last found that it is the gainer and not the loser by an entirely liberal hospitality to the work of Americans."

The opportunities for hearing music, which have grown and multiplied exceedingly in recent years, have increased not only the attention paid to music and the enjoyment to be derived therefrom by all classes of people, but also the consideration in which music as a factor in social life is held.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is now said that the American musician has reached a point where he needs no apology. This statement has been, and may be, taken in two ways. If, as meaning that the American composer has arrived at a point where, having mastered the technical details of his calling, he is now in a position as a craftsman to rank with the best and to be judged by his honest qualifications and merits and not by any sentimental standard of mere nationality, it is all very well. If, however, this dictum be taken to mean that the American musician, with all the difficulty he has had and still has to contend with, is considered strong enough to meet single-handed, and without the definite support from his countrymen which a larger confidence in his ability would give, the competition with the musical products of nations centuries older than his own, it is, I think, misleading. It is that lack of national confidence in national ability, from which the manifold difficulties the American composer encounters in obtaining a hearing spring, which is also a principal underlying cause of our retarded development in the field of musical creativeness.

More frequent opportunities of public performance the American composer at this time both sadly lacks and urgently needs; for how can the work of any composer be properly judged unheard? Such opportunities are essential as an after result of creative effort not only in giving the public the opportunity of judging a composer by his work, but also in supplying the composer with the needed stimulus and incentive of popular recognition and appreciation, and in enabling him to estimate his own accomplishment with greater clearness and accuracy.

It has been recently stated by a writer on musical topics that it is incredible, and impossible to suppose, that a worthy musical work by an American composer would be refused due and proper recognition by the American public because of its American origin, and that it is therefore unnecessary and unprofitable to bring before the public musical works by American composers of unknown or doubtful merit. Of what good to any one are silent scores and unpublished manuscripts that gather dust on library shelves? My own personal experience has taught me that the unwillingness of the American public to accept native musical works because of their American origin is neither incredible nor impossible to suppose. Our youth as a musical nation, which makes us diffident about expressing a definite opinion unsupported

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by previous foreign criticism, is largely responsible for a condition of affairs as undoubted as it is unfortunate.

It is national pride as well as national feeling that begets national art—that Nationalism in Music, which we need to become the musical nation that our natural characteristics seem to point to as something more than a possibility.

As bearing on the above, it is indeed much to be deplored that the terms of the competition for a prize for the best American Grand Opera, as recently announced by the Metropolitan Opera Company, an idea admirable in its conception in affording the needed opportunity for the American composer to be heard, are such as to render the whole plan nugatory and indeed almost farcical. Through the illiberality and injustice of its financial conditions, whereby the composer, for a sum barely adequate to compensate him for the time spent in its construction, is compelled to give his successful work for nothing for a period of five years, and whereby they carefully reserve to themselves the right not to award any prize at all, the Metropolitan Opera Company have, in my judgment, given conclusive evidence of their entire inability to appreciate existing conditions, as well as of the usual lack of confidence in the ability of the American composer to produce any meritorious musical work at all—a direct outcome of the foreign influences which hamper and retard our national progress and development.

France is to-day the centre of the art-producing world. That she is so is largely due to the fact that the French people prefer to hear French music, to see French pictures and statuary, and go to the theatre to hear French plays—meaning, in each instance, the works of Frenchmen—than those of any other nationality. Such a national confidence in national ability is undoubtedly the greatest possible incentive and stimulus to artistic effort. When once we are willing to admit, as the French do in regard to themselves, that the work of Americans is and can be of itself good and worthy, and if found equal to the works of others when judged by similar standards, should be preferred to them, we shall stand a better chance than we have to-day of developing in this country a musical art which, as an outgrowth of national feeling, shall be furthermore distinctly national because supported by national confidence and pride.

REGINALD DE KOVEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME RECOLLECTIONS OF PRESIDENT McKINLEY AND THE CUBAN INTERVENTION.

BY DR. HENRY S. PRITCHETT, PRESIDENT OF THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING.

GOING over old letter-files is like digging in old ash-heaps—one must uncover an enormous mass of rubbish to recover even a modest prize. Most men in administrative places leave their literary accumulations to be cast into the pit by their successors. Now and then a fire or a removal forces one to sift over and reassort his own literary scrap-pile. It was in the process made necessary by the second of these calamities that I ran across, some months ago, a memorandum dated May 2nd, 1899, which contained in my own handwriting an interesting explanation I had heard President McKinley make that night concerning his own attitude toward the questions which arose through the Cuban difficulties and the war with Spain. The story of how the paper came to be written is this:

In the autumn of 1897 I had been appointed by President McKinley, upon the recommendation of Secretary Gage, Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, a scientific bureau of the Government organized nearly a hundred years ago. I had never met the President until after my appointment, and I had, of course, no reason to anticipate, as a bureau chief, any other acquaintance with him than the limited official one which my duties might involve. The accident of the Spanish War furnished the unexpected occasion for a somewhat closer personal relation.

After Admiral Dewey left Hongkong for Manila, I had followed his movements on one of the British Admiralty charts. In the first messages received from the scene of action appeared the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

words "Subig Bay," "Corregidor Island," "Cavite" and other names which were strange enough to our ears then, but now have the ring of household words. A glance at the chart on the morning of May 2nd showed their relative positions, and made so intelligible the telegraphic account of the battle that I wondered whether the President had any satisfactory map of the region. Having occasion during the morning to visit the State Department, in connection with the preparation of material relating to the Alaska boundary dispute, I rolled up the chart I had been using, stopped at the White House, and handed it to Mr. Porter, then Secretary to the President. Mr. Porter expressed great surprise at the existence of such a chart, and said it contained exactly the sort of information which was greatly desired. He added that the President was alone, and he suggested that I go in with him at once and take the chart to the President.

We found the President alone—an unusual thing at that time and for that hour of the day. Preliminary messages had been received from Admiral Dewey the evening before, announcing the victory of May 1st, and the President was at the moment engaged in reading the complete despatches, which were being sent from the Navy Department in sections as fast as they were translated out of the cipher. He was using a small map of the Philippine Islands about as long as one's hand, apparently taken from a school geography. (This was the day when, as Mr. Dooley remarked, Few of us knew whether the Philippines were islands or canned goods.) On this small map, Manila Bay was no larger than a pea, and none of the details of the shore line and local topography could be made out. The moment that the Admiralty chart was spread out, showing the great sweep of Manila Bay, with its comparatively narrow entrance, the messages the President was reading could forthwith be understood. We spent a half hour reading these messages, ending with the final description of the complete destruction of the Spanish fleet, and leaving us all aglow with national feeling. It was an interesting moment to spend with the President of the United States.

As I rose to go the President stopped me. "I think," said he, "I have a job for you, and, if you will come with me, I would like to show you what it is." Leading the way across the reception-room, he took me to the small room in the southeast corner occupied by the telegraph department, of which Colonel Mont-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gomery was chief. "It is evident," said the President, "that I must learn a deal of geography in this war, and I am going to turn over to you the task of furnishing me the necessary maps and charts. These walls will be at your disposal, and I shall feel greatly indebted if you will see that there are placed here such maps and charts as will be of assistance to me in the questions which are sure to arise in the course of the war now upon us. I will see that your men are given admission here, at any time, to place upon the walls such maps as you think necessary."

The task thus committed to me was one of the most interesting one could undertake. The Coast Survey has in its service some of the most skilled cartographers in the world. We ransacked every source for such maps of the Philippines, of the West Indies, and of other countries concerning which information was desired. When a map of the proper size and with the proper information upon it could not be had, maps were prepared in the office of the Coast Survey. On one or two occasions, these maps were prepared on a large scale in the course of a single night's work. There was placed upon them the information which showed cable lines, coaling stations and other matters germane to the study to which they would be subjected.

It was my habit to visit this room, which came after a while to be called the "map-room," once or twice a week, to see how the work was being carried out. Occasionally, on these visits, I met the President, who was always friendly and considerate, and always most appreciative of any effort to help him. He was a man who gave his confidence rather slowly but very completely, and in the course of the year I came to entertain toward him a gradually increasing feeling of friendship and intimacy; for the map-making was continued for the different provinces of the Philippines long after the Spanish War had ended.

It was in virtue of the acquaintance thus made that I occasionally called at the White House in the evening in response to his invitation. On the 2nd of May, 1899, a Sunday evening, I happened to make such a call, and found the President and Mrs. McKinley engaged in a game of cribbage. Mrs. McKinley soon retired, and the President lit a cigar and began to talk. I reminded him that just a year ago that day I had brought to him a map of Manila Bay and its environs. The remark awoke in him a series of reminiscences of the past year, and he began to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speak, first, in a somewhat casual way, but later with great earnestness, concerning the events of the year and his own part in them. As he went on, his earnestness grew; and at the last he spoke with some emotion, saying that what he had done had been in the most sincere desire to serve the interests of the country and of humanity; that the things which he had done he had considered with great care; that he had not only thought over them, but prayed over them; and that he could only hope that the outcome would be justified. The conversation seemed so unusual an one that, after leaving him, I wrote down, as nearly as I could remember, the salient points of his talk, and it was this paper which turned up in my removal of some months ago, to bring back the memories of the man and of the occasion.

President McKinley began by saying that he could scarcely realize that a full year had passed since the morning to which I alluded—a year which, he said, had been crowded full of momentous events altogether different from those with which he had expected to deal when he came to the Presidency. He had found himself compelled to face, at the beginning of his administration, a series of questions wholly outside the range of those which ordinarily came to a President of the United States.

The matter of which the President spoke with most feeling was his conviction that, if he had been left alone, he could have concluded an arrangement with the Spanish Government under which the Spanish troops would have withdrawn from Cuba without a war. Of this he spoke with great frankness, stating most explicitly his conviction that, but for the inflamed state of public opinion and the fact that Congress could no longer be held in check, a peaceful solution might have been had.

Of the consequences which the war brought he spoke with less certainty, but with great earnestness. As the war advanced and the question of the possible addition of new territory came up, the President stated that he had at first felt opposed to the addition of any of the outlying territory to our possessions. He had felt at the beginning doubtful even about Hawaii and Porto Rico, but as time went on and the alternatives had to be faced which the rejection of these countries would involve, he had felt compelled to take Hawaii and Porto Rico as the least dangerous experiment. As to the Philippines, he stated that at the beginning he had felt entirely opposed to the retention of any part

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these islands; but here again the difficulties of the alternative had gradually influenced him. He had desired at first to retain a coaling station; then all of Manila Bay; then all of Luzon; and, finally, he had come to the decision that the occupancy of the entire island group was, under the circumstances, the wisest course for his Government to pursue.

Just what the reasons were which gradually led President McKinley to change his opinion were not made clear in his talk, notwithstanding the earnestness with which he spoke of his convictions; but it was clear from the references which he made that two influences had profoundly affected him: first, the belief that this policy was the wish of the American people; and, second, the conviction that our government of the Philippines would be a sort of national missionary effort, which would result in great good to the people of those islands and exert a most salutary effect on our own politics.

The President spoke with more earnestness and with more definiteness as to his regret for the war itself than as to the complications which arose from it. There could be no question of his firm belief that, if left alone, he could have settled the matter without a war. The situation in Congress finally came to a point where, in his opinion, it was impossible for him to stop the war current. What the causes were which led up to this condition he did not indicate with great definiteness, otherwise than to mention incidentally the incessant newspaper agitation, the emotionalism of certain members of the House and of the Senate, and the stampeding of Congress under the impression that the country was demanding immediate hostilities. Whether this spirit could have been dealt with successfully by a man made of sterner stuff than President McKinley, it would be difficult at this time to say. Perhaps few people realize the excited state of feeling in which men in public life lived during the first months of 1898. One who turns back to the files of the daily press of those days and reads the frantic appeals which were poured out, will understand in what a ferment the public mind must have been to accept such expressions of prejudice and passion. One appreciates also, at this distance in time, the success with which the accusation of low motives was pressed against those who stood resolutely for a peaceful solution of our differences with Spain.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1898 the most powerful offices under our Government—the Presidency and the Speakership of the House—were filled by William McKinley and Thomas B. Reed. These two men were not in sympathy with each other politically or personally; but in the belief that war was unnecessary they were thoroughly agreed, and all the influence which went with their great places was thrown into the effort to stem the current setting for war.

I remember a scene in the Speaker's office just before the outbreak of war, which illustrated not only his attitude in this matter, but the quickness of his wit. I had gone to his office at his request in relation to certain matters connected with the business of the Coast Survey. As we sat talking, a Southern member of Congress burst into the room, his face aflame with excitement, a newspaper in his hand. Planting the paper on the table before the Speaker, he demanded in an excited voice whether a civilized nation would permit such things as were there described within ninety miles of its borders. Slowly adjusting his glasses, the Speaker cast his eye over the paper. At the top, in large head-lines, was a story of the sufferings of the reconcentrados. But about half-way down the page, in smaller lines, was an account of an assault on a negro postmaster in one of the Southern States. Instead of reading the top lines, the Speaker read in his drawling voice the lower set of head-lines: "The Postmaster at Blank Shot — His Wife Ill-treated — His House Burned." "Why, my friend," said he, in the same drawling tone, "that can't be down South; that must be over in Cuba. If we had a civilization like that we wouldn't want to spread it over Cuba anyhow, would we?" By that time the would-be savior of Cuba was well on his way out of the room.

To the end of his life Mr. Reed could not refer to those days without emotion, and he believed, whether rightly or not, that if a calm presentation of the facts could have been had, peaceful means would have accomplished the ends which this nation sought. However that may be, no thoughtful man could observe the interaction among an irresponsible press, emotional politicians and an excited public without alarm, and without realizing, whatever his attitude to the Cuban question, the dangers of such a situation and the difficulty of securing the essential facts for calm action.

Just why everybody was ready to fight except a few men, like

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. McKinley and Mr. Reed, was not exactly clear. There was a propaganda for war, fed by newspapers primarily, assisted by a few politicians, and eventually becoming a matter of party rivalry. At the last, it became a race to see who could push the nation into war soonest.

There is one sad ghost of the days of 1898 which I wish might be decently laid. When the American enters Havana Harbor the bones of the "Maine," gaunt and bare, are almost the first object to meet his eye. The wreck lies at the edge of the fairway, a daily menace to navigation. When the visitor inquires why it has not been removed, he is told that the port officials would have long ago removed it, but fear to throw an unwelcome light on a question already decided. It is better, they say, to let sleeping dogs lie.

It is extremely improbable that the removal of the "Maine's" wreckage would throw any light on the question of its destruction. But, whether it did or not, the nation which was strong enough and unselfish enough to go to war to end what was believed to be an intolerable situation is strong enough to have the truth known. The sight of this ill-fated hulk rising above the waters of the harbor, pathetic as it is to an American, is a source of constant irritation to many of the inhabitants of Cuba; and the failure to remove it is naturally looked upon as a weakness. The postal-card venders reap a rich harvest from it, recalling in a very literal way Quay's words about making merchandise of the "Maine's" dead. Its complete removal would not only be in the interest of navigation, but would banish from the public gaze a reminder of a bitter episode which is best forgot.

HENRY S. PRITCHETT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN AFTER-GLANCE AT THE VISIT OF THE AMERICAN FLEET TO AUSTRALIA.

BY THE RT. HON. GEORGE HOUSTON REID.

THE Australian continent is divided from all other continents by a vast expanse of ocean. When the white man came, he found the aboriginals in possession feeble alike in numbers and in spirit. There were few forests and no impenetrable jungles. Even the wild animals were harmless. The only serious troubles which faced the Australian pioneer were two: the problem of water-supply and his remoteness from civilization.

In the inevitable struggless between the black possessors and the white intruders, little blood was shed and comparatively few lives were lost. The first and only flag of a foreign country whose staff was ever planted in the soil of this great island, of three million square miles, was the British flag, raised by Captain Cook, when he landed in Botany Bay, near Sydney, from His Majesty's ship "Endeavor," in 1770. There were, therefore, no complications arising from rival white settlements. Nor has any hostile demonstration ever been aimed at these shores.

This brief recital shows how free from difficulty, danger or disorder the path of enterprise in Australia has been. The contrast between American and Australian history in that respect is immense. English, French and Spanish pioneers in America had to fight, first, for every inch of ground and footing they gained against men of marvellous ferocity, cunning, tenacity and cruelty. The struggle went on every day and every year, from the Gulf to the St. Lawrence, from New England to the Far West. Then, too, unlike Australia, with its vast open spaces, North America opposed to the settler not only powerful native enemies, of consummate heroism and craft, but also giant forests which screened the red men and ambushed the white. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alternatives before the white men were a life of incessant hardship and toil if they were fortunate, and a cruel death for themselves and perils worse than death for their wives and daughters if they were not. And when the reflective observer studies the fabulous growth of the United States in these latter days, and admires the immense prospect of smiling harvests and magnificent cities which are the wonder of the world, his mind cannot help glancing back to the seed-time of all these marvels, to the men of the axe and the rifle, and their women and children, scattered through frontier settlements, surrounded by hosts of relentless foes. No stately monuments mark the places where the dust of the American backwoodsmen is reposing—for them there is no Westminster Abbey; yet, in sober truth, they are amongst the greatest heroes and benefactors of mankind, and their memory was and is of far greater value to America than all the wealth of Wall Street. On the other hand, with so few dangers to overcome, so few enemies to subdue, it is not strange that Australia's progress has been rapid, or that the Australian people are prosperous and happy.

Although our population is under 4,200,000, fifteen million tons of shipping enter our ports every year. Our total foreign trade is three hundred and fifty million dollars—about eighty-five dollars a head. There are one million, two hundred and sixty thousand depositors in our savings-banks, with two hundred and ten million dollars to their credit. Too much cannot be said of the lot of the Australian people in point of actual comfort and enjoyment of the possibilities of life. But this happy condition is not the result of any profound political sagacity. It is explained by the simple fact that in Australia the Anglo-Saxon has had Nature working for him more fully than anywhere else.

We have seven parliaments—one Federal and six State legislatures—each with two separate houses. We have vote by ballot, and adult suffrage is almost universal. Such an organization as a conservative party does not exist in Australia. The main difference between parties is that one party is sometimes more radical than the other. The most interesting novelties in Australia are the Labor Party and the laws respecting industrial disputes. The representatives of the Labor Party are subject to outside labor leagues and pledged to platforms adopted by these bodies. They must vote together on all the planks and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policies approved by these leagues. Without the long-standing distinctions of party and issue and principle which divide American partisans, there is yet much of strenuousness in Australian politics. The different elements of the newly federated States have not yet come sufficiently together to establish bases of settled policy, and the main divisions, at present, are along lines between labor and capital. Elections to the Federal Parliament are contested, as yet, largely upon the basis of local controversies. The seat of power rests in the majority of the popular branch of Parliament, and the Ministry is constituted to represent the majority in this body. A Ministry may fall simply as the result of the breaking up of existing combinations, without any general election to change the complexion of the body.

The labor laws cover two main systems—Wages Boards and Arbitration Courts. The Boards are formed of equal numbers of employed and employers, with a neutral chairman, and all of the decisions are final. The Courts have a Judge President, who has power to determine disputes and conditions and penalties. The employer and trades unions have power to arrive at agreements which can be registered and enforced. Preference to the unions can be given, in the courts, if the judge so decides. The Wages Boards do not discriminate between unionists and non-unionists, and so far the Wages Boards seem to create the least friction and to accomplish the best results; while the Courts seem to excite more trouble than ever before. When the awards suit the men, naturally there is no objection; but, when they do not, the whole machinery often seems ready to break down. It is too soon to speak positively on the matter, however. The stage of experiment is not passed. With a loyal acceptance of awards, on both sides, the system would work well; but without it—and that is too often the case—it becomes the perfection of strife, confusion and injustice.

The great task before Australia is to work out the harmony of union under peaceful conditions, which was wrought in the United States through the dire necessity of union for strength against outside assault. One of the fortunate and helpful incidents along this line was the visit of the American fleet.

Some censorious critics in America, I understand, assigned a warlike motive to the despatch of the battleships from Hampton Roads, but the event has become one of world-wide importance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for very different reasons. It has now been realized by every one that the display of naval power by the United States was in the interests of universal peace. Not so long ago, such a display would have meant a crisis of some kind, but one of the very best of the good things the modern world is getting accustomed to is the exhibition of force in the cause of peace and good will, and the American fleet did a great deal, in many ways, to increase the happiness and content of the nations.

Undoubtedly, it did as much for America as for other nations. The unprecedented voyage is a striking proof of the changed attitude of the United States toward international politics. The nation is no longer an idle spectator of foreign diplomacy. The strenuous life is no longer restricted to its own affairs. The American people are beginning to see that their commercial interests compel them, if nothing else would, to take part in the shaping of the world's destinies. This is a very good thing for the world at large. National jealousies and greed have been the greatest shedders of human blood, and they still cast ominous shadows. The United States cannot be jealous of any other nation; their own lot is too enviable. The United States cannot be greedy; they enjoy a share of the world's resources and prosperity which allows infinite room for magnificent development, but leaves none for morbid craving. The cause of universal harmony has everything to gain from the new line taken by the United States, the Great Republic, in becoming an active member of the family of Nations.

The President's acceptance of our invitation to send the fleet over to visit us was hailed with delight by all classes of the Australian people. It was a kindly recognition of the new Commonwealth. It was an admission, at once gracious and sagacious, that the greatest federation in the world and the youngest have a future on the Pacific which gravely concerns them both. The acceptance of the invitation meant even more than that. It made the good understanding which now happily prevails between the Imperial and the American Governments more conspicuous than it was before; for one cannot but realize that a very few years ago the project would have found many unfriendly minds on both sides of the Atlantic. Even now it was an experiment, and the enthusiasm of the welcomes showered upon the fleet in New Zealand, and again and again in Australia, evidently

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

created in the minds of the Admirals, the officers and men of the fleet, a feeling of pleased surprise. They could not realize till then the boundless cordiality of Australians when some one comes along whom they are delighted to honor.

The analysis of the overwhelming demonstrations which greeted the war vessels of the United States is not difficult. The people of Australia live at an immense distance from the imposing spectacles and gigantic realities of the older nations. Old-World storms have never seriously ruffled the placid surface of the antipodes. Few of us have been able to travel. Our own continent is not only remote, it is thinly settled and bare of great events. The intense strain of human need and the tremendous energy of human effort, which exhaust and sadden mankind in the Northern Hemisphere, have not yet made serious call on the exuberant spirits of Young Australia. Then we have the blood of sea-faring races in our veins. Of all the stirring sights that could be offered us, none could raise our interest and admiration to a higher pitch than the splendid fleet of modern battleships which America sent to visit us. As it came to anchor in each successive port, it realized our highest expectations. Terrible as the engines of destruction were, they excited no sensation of fear, but universal feelings of confidence and delight. They had steamed the longest and most brilliant voyage a fleet of modern battleships has ever made, and they did it as bearers of messages of peace and good will from the most populous white nation in the world to all the world. The decks of the sixteen monsters were cleared, but not for action—for hospitality and friendship.

Australians of every class and creed have been profoundly touched by this emphatic demonstration of the friendship and kinship of the United States. Even the War of Independence was not a war between the people of the Colonies and the people of Great Britain and Ireland. In those days wars were mainly sources of amusement and profit to the idle and privileged rich who instigated them. The British people never have declared and never will declare war against the American people. They were the first to perceive that the American colonists, in their triumph, won a glorious victory for *freedom, always and everywhere.* That a few unseasoned yeomen should overcome disciplined British armies so soon after Plassey and Quebec is one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of history's sublimest proofs of the power of a good cause. Only a few years later, when the vanquished oppressor assumed her rightful place and became the champion of the world's liberties, she easily overthrew the matchless power of Napoleon, whose veterans had trampled on all of the dynasties of Europe.

Through the visit of the fleet, the American and the Australian peoples have met really for the first time. The delusions of distance and ignorance and the caricatures of humor have been corrected by the reality of contact. The Admirals, officers and men earned unbounded admiration by their conduct on all occasions. The United States may well be proud of their representatives. Admiral Sperry's speeches were weighty, and his sentiments well chosen and happily expressed. He did the fullest justice to the Mother Country, the Empire and the British Navy, while our demonstrations of good feeling gave him no occasion to act as champion of his own country. There was no cloud hanging over the visit. Our own delight, as profoundly loyal subjects of King Edward, in honoring our American cousins, reflected the feeling of kinship which now dominates the relations between the two greatest powers the world has ever known. We rejoice in the growing friendship between Great Britain and the United States. Peace could have no better champions. Humanity could have no better allies. Their united power is the best guaranty the world has ever had of a new reign of justice, liberty and progress in all parts of the globe.

GEORGE HOUSTON REID.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROHIBITION AND PUBLIC MORALS.

BY THE REV. HENRY COLMAN, D.D.

THE foes of prohibition and scoffers at total abstinence hasten to the Bible as their storehouse of weaponry; so the defenders of polygamy and of slavery have ever wrapped themselves with Scripture texts. I lately listened to an eloquent Jewish rabbi, who elaborately described the Decalogue as God's standard of right and wrong for all nations and all times. He then with great emphasis reasoned that, as none of these ten commandments says, "Thou shalt not drink," therefore the use of intoxicants is not a sin. The learned logician did not add that this standard of morals for all time does not forbid drunkenness, wife-beating, gambling, polygamy or slave-holding. Indeed, after reading to the people these tables of stone, amid the most solemn ritual ever accompanying religious instruction, Moses made provision for polygamy and slave-holding among the "chosen people." The Decalogue simply registered the highest standard of righteousness that could then be effectively given to men. He who has no higher standard of morals than the teachings of Moses lingers in the dim morning of the Christian day. Christ spoke the word that illumines Old Testament teachings, and throws a great light on His own, when He said, "Because of the hardness of your hearts, Moses permitted to give a writing of divorcement."

Many also array Christ among the enemies of total abstinence and of prohibition. True, the Christ did not condemn the cup. But when did He rebuke drunkenness, polygamy or slave-holding? Has the Christian been mistaken in branding as crimes customs which the Saviour did not specifically condemn? He showed us a better gospel and prophesied the infinite progress of His Church, through the ages yet before us, when He told His dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciples, during that last day of teaching, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth." How many things right to-day will be found wrong to-morrow, we cannot prophesy. Certain that in His wondrous wisdom, Jesus opened the door for betterment without limit.

That Christ in any way sanctioned the drinking habits, the liquor traffic or the saloon of our time no one will affirm. The drinking of His day wrought no such wholesale havoc as we now witness. Even if He did use a little of the mild alcoholic wines common then, He cannot be cited as approving the practices and resulting evils which the people are so successfully suppressing. But can proof be found that He did use them? His enemies styled Him a "wine-bibber," whether falsely or truthfully we have no means to determine. Nor, if He did use wine, have we evidence that it was fermented. At the Last Supper, "He took the cup." What was in the cup? He named it "the fruit of the vine." It is significant that nowhere in the Bible is "wine" mentioned in connection with the Lord's Supper. The Mosaic law forbade leaven in the bread at the Passover. Jesus took the Passover cup. As no ferment was allowed in the bread, it is not unreasonable to infer that it was not permitted in the drink. A rabbi, thirty years ago, said to a friend of mine that not till two hundred years before did the Jews use fermented wine at the Passover. I do not know his authority, but the statement appears reasonable.

Nor is the oft-repeated argument from the wine at the marriage feast conclusive. The word of the ruler of the feast to the host, "Thou hast kept the good wine till now," is proof positive to the devotee of Bacchus that it was intoxicating. To the abstainer, it is assurance that it was "new" wine. The incident alone throws no light on the habits of Jesus. A word of Jesus spoken on another occasion affords help. He said, "Neither do men put new wine into old wineskins, else the skins burst." If this has any meaning, it must refer to a custom of preserving new wine from fermenting. New wine, put into a new skin and kept under water or in a cool place, might be preserved. If new wine were put into an old skin, and the skin left open, the wine would simply ferment. But, if the mouth of the skin were closely fastened, the remains of the first filling, left around in the corners

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and crevices of the skin, would set the new to fermenting and cause loss. It must have been much more expensive to preserve the new wine than the fermented. During the grape harvest, the new wine might be as cheap as the old, but later it must be more costly. How natural, then, that the new wine should be called "the good wine."

It is not claimed that this reasoning proves positively the total abstinence of Jesus in the modern sense of that term, nor that Paul was recommending new wine when he prescribed, "Take a little wine for thy stomach's sake." But the above facts do show that Christ cannot be claimed as sanctioning in any way the use of mild alcoholic beverages. Much less did He approve the American saloons, which are so rapidly disappearing from the country.

A ghastly argument, yet one often repeated in voice and type, is that we need the traffic in intoxicants, really the saloon, to enable us by resisting its temptations to grow a race of moral giants. We wait long and vainly from these defenders of the wine that "biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder," for one word concerning those who yield to the temptation and, weaklings, imbeciles, stumble their zigzag way through jail and poorhouse to a drunkard's grave. These are the fruits of the temptation plan. These are the giants the business makes, giant failures in all that renders life valuable, while the men whose parents guarded them from the fierce temptations of the "maddening bowl" are conquering the nations for Jesus Christ.

Are the Legislatures all mistaken in forbidding the sale of liquor to minors or inflicting fines upon him who allows a minor in the place where intoxicants are sold? If the temptations of the saloon are so wholesome, why not legislate a saloon on every corner, and send runners out to solicit customers—that they may hear the ribald talk, the low obscenity and the loud profanity, and thus add a cubit to their moral stature every day? Surely, he who is deceived by such saloon arguments is "not wise." How different from the Saviour-taught prayer, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one." If America harbors any evil one from whom we need to pray for deliverance, it is the saloon and its annex.

But, lest the temptation argument should be taken too seriously, its advocate, before his words have dropped, interjects, "We must regulate it." But why regulate an institution so beneficent?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If it is creating saints, tried and tested, why curb its workings? The Beloved Disciple assures us that his Master came to destroy the works of the devil. Writing of the effects of strong drink, Ambrose Shepherd says, "They are incarnated in horrors. . . . The injuries that simply swarm out of our licensed temptations to drunkenness are not exceptional and irregular; they are, as one of our most eminent publicists has said, 'uniform as the movements of the planets, and as deadly as the sirocco of the desert or the malaria of the marshes.'" The prohibitionist holds that the business should be destroyed rather than regulated. If he cannot destroy it wholly, he is willing to help regulate it by lessening its evils and destroying it little by little.

The prohibitionist is by no means satisfied with defending his position with Scriptural or moral weapons. He claims that the community has a complete right to outlaw the liquor traffic, especially the saloon, because the traffic in no way enhances the well-being of the community. It brings no contribution to either life, liberty or the pursuit of happiness. The prohibitionist does not aim to forbid the use of alcohol in the arts or as a medicine. Yet we cannot ignore the fact that it is rapidly falling into disuse in the sick-room. A physician said to me that he had ceased to prescribe it, except in the crisis of a fever, when he used it as he would a whip to drive a horse through a miry place. One day, he noticed that his patient grew bluer and bluer, instead of showing the glow of increased circulation. He watched cases with care, and learned that, though the pulse became faster under the influence of alcohol, it lost volume and vigor. He prescribed it no more even for a fever. He is one of a growing number in the medical fraternity.

The old belief that alcoholic beverages increase for a time mental activity and add to muscle strength and endurance is demonstrated to be a gross fallacy. The most careful scientific experiments, especially in Germany, show that even a little weakens arm and retards the mind. Employers have learned that the man who takes simply his beer with his meal is less efficient than without it. His eye is less clear, his hand responds more slowly; accidents are more numerous, and his work is less satisfactory in quantity and quality. Corporations are discouraging the use of alcoholic liquors, or forbidding it altogether. It does no good. There is a certain hilarity, resulting from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drink, or a temporary stupidity that forgets trouble; but it is safe to say that human happiness is not improved by intoxicants.

No one proposes a law forbidding the use of intoxicants. The enemies of prohibition claim that more liquors are consumed under prohibition than under license. If so, personal liberty is not violated by prohibitory laws.

Holy Writ assures us that no man liveth unto himself. It is most certain that no man drinketh unto himself. The drink business affects the whole nation. It is the great impoverisher. It receives voraciously, but never gives. Without the least compensation it absorbs from one billion five hundred million to three hundred billion of the national wealth each year. It is true that money paid over saloon counters for drinks is not burned or buried. But the money is lost to individuals, most of whom can least afford it. The capital invested in the traffic, the time of the men employed, the time lost by drinkers, the lessened energy of brain or muscle of workmen in all walks of life, the loss through drink-caused sickness, the depreciated future value to the state of children whom drink-impoverishment robs of an education, at least one-half the cost of criminals, insane and poor, and other charges beyond enumeration, make a financial indictment against the traffic equal at least to the vast sums just mentioned. Every one would be richer but for this heavy drain on our national resources, and every one has a right to demand the prohibition of the pauperizer.

Leading business men, especially in Ohio, are taking a prominent part in securing prohibition, by county local option, because they learn that closing the saloons pays poor debts, increases business, erects new houses and lessens taxes. The decrease of crime-expense and increase of property values greatly overbalance the license money from the saloons. Thus sixty-two of the eighty-eight counties of Ohio have bid the saloon begone. Eight counties more are expected to heed the warning, "whoso is deceived thereby is not wise," and join the prohibition army. Governor Hoch has told of the empty jails and poorhouses all over Kansas. Bankers and merchants of Kansas City of that State, who at first strenuously opposed law enforcement against the saloons, now unite cheerfully in testifying to the increase in bank deposits, the enlarged sales of all goods, the improved collections and the building boom. Empty jails indicate high morals. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saloons being banished, poor lists shrink and school attendance swells. Hundreds of children, who were in training for loafers and thugs, turn to the schools and become producers and statesmen in the making.

The liquor traffic depopulates schools and crowds jails, it weakens churches and multiplies brothels, it desolates homes and fills cemeteries. Occasionally it perverts the daily press and at times taints the pulpit itself.

The courts of every grade have repeatedly affirmed the rightness of prohibition. In the case of Crowley *vs.* Christiansen (137 U. S., 86; 11 Sup. Ct., 13), the United States Supreme Court, through Justice Field, said:

"By the general concurrence of opinion of every civilized and Christian community, there are few sources of crime and misery to society equal to the dram-shop, where intoxicating liquors, in small quantities, to be drunk at the time, are sold indiscriminately to all parties applying. The statistics of every State show a greater amount of crime and misery attributable to the use of ardent spirits obtained at these retail liquor-saloons than to any other source. The sale of such liquors in this way has, therefore, been, at all times, by the courts of every State, considered as the proper subject of legislative regulation. Not only may a license be exacted from the keeper of the saloon before a glass of his liquor can be thus disposed of, but restrictions may be imposed as to the class of persons to whom they may be sold, and the hours of the day and the days of the week on which the saloons may be opened. Their sale in that form may be absolutely prohibited. It is a question of public expediency and public morality, and not of Federal law. The police power of the State is fully competent to regulate the business, to mitigate its evils or to suppress it entirely. There is no inherent right in a citizen to sell intoxicating liquors by retail. It is not a privilege of the citizen of the State or of a citizen of the United States. As it is a business attended with danger to the community, it may, as already said, be entirely prohibited, or continued to be permitted under such conditions as will limit to the utmost its evils."

In the case of Stone *vs.* Mississippi (101 U. S., 816), the same court said, "No legislature can bargain away the public health or the public morals. The people themselves cannot do it, much less their servants." This pronouncement of the Supreme Court fully warrants the decision of Judge Artman, of Indiana, that no legislative enactment can legalize the sale of intoxicating beverages. As sure as Christianity continues its triumphs, so sure will Judge Artman's decision become the law of the land.

HENRY COLMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW IRELAND.—X.

"THE NATIONALISTS."

BY SYDNEY BROOKS.

I ENDEAVORED, in my last article, to show the influence of the new forces that are remaking Ireland upon the temper and prospects of the Unionists, of the British "garrison," of the old ascendency party. Their effect, however, is far from being confined to the "loyal" minority. It is equally operative and dissolvent in the case of the members and supporters of the Irish Nationalist Party. It is, indeed, a remarkable fact that none of the new elements in the Irish situation owes anything to the Nationalists, that one of these elements is pronouncedly hostile to the pretensions of that party, and that of the remainder that party has been obliged, in sheer self-defence, to fall in behind some, while others it has unavailingly striven to cripple and discredit. Thus the Sinn Féin movement, which is rapidly capturing the youth of Ireland, is a blow at the very heart of Parliamentarianism. The Gaelic League, again, had won an established place for itself in the hearts of the people before the Nationalist M.P.'s seemed even aware of its existence; and to the Agricultural Co-operative movement, the activities of the Department of Agriculture, and, indeed, to every effort to make Ireland more prosperous and self-reliant and to regenerate her from within, the Party leaders have opposed an obstruction as unremitting as it has been futile. These are deplorable tactics. They raise the presumption that the demand for Home Rule is in inverse ratio to Irish well-being, and that official Nationalism would rather see grievances go unredressed than throw away a single weapon of agitation. Moreover, they prevent the industrial and economic side of the case for Home Rule from being set before the British

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public in its most effective and convincing form, and they enormously impair the moral authority of the party that, having adopted them, is unable to impose them upon the electorate. There are standpoints from which it may be said that no two men living have done more to hinder the material betterment of Ireland than Mr. Redmond and Mr. Dillon. My complaint against them is not in the least that they are anti-English. It is that they are not sufficiently pro-Irish. They have been dragged reluctantly in the wake of movements they should have led, and they have excommunicated enterprises that the people have welcomed and made the most of. And they are paying the penalty in a visible loss of influence, in the rise of rival agitations, and in a gathering stress of centrifugal dissension and discontent.

Indeed, there is something singularly precarious in the whole position of the Irish Party just now. It is a party not only without a Parnell, but without the National movement that Parnell evoked. The Irish, it has often been said, are an aristocratic people. They have a genuine instinct for being led; one of their greatest misfortunes, indeed, is that they have never yet had the right sort of leadership. They will follow a man further and cleave to him longer than almost any people on earth. But all this, while true, is not unreservedly so. To lead the Irish successfully you must be one of two things. You must either be magnificently Irish yourself, as O'Connell was; or, like Parnell and, to some degree, Isaac Butt, you must have little or nothing characteristically Irish about you. The one being the Irish will not follow is the mediocre Irishman. I will not say that Mr. Redmond is a mediocre Irishman, but I will say that even his real Parliamentary capacities do not raise the enthusiasm that is felt for him in Ireland beyond the obligatory amount that must always gather round the leader of the National cause. Mr. Redmond is a considerably greater power in the House of Commons than in his own country. Lacking both the fervor of O'Connell and the commanding and authoritative reserve of Parnell, he never quite reaches either the hearts or the instincts of the Irish people. Spending most of his time in London and absorbed in Parliamentary manœuvres, he is far more out of touch with popular sentiment than he should be. Nobody suspects his devotion to Home Rule, but nobody, on the other hand, is going to mention him in the same breath with Wolfe Tone. The Irish people,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while they have a certain respect for his abilities, feel no affection for him, are disenchanted by his aloofness, and are more than half inclined to whisper that he has a good deal of the landlord in his composition. And even in the Party itself his authority has its distinct limitations. Mr. Healy stands outside it and Mr. William O'Brien has headed a movement of rivalry, if not of downright opposition, all the more formidable for being based on common sense. Nearly the whole of the province of Munster looks to Mr. O'Brien for leadership, while throughout the rest of Nationalist Ireland for every once that you will hear Mr. Redmond's name mentioned you will hear Mr. Dillon's half a dozen times. It is only officially that Mr. Redmond is the leader of the Irish Party. His position in Parliament, at the head of a compact group of eighty members, is out of all proportion to his influence and popularity in Ireland. Under his leadership the effective authority of Party headquarters has steadily contracted and discipline has as steadily relaxed.

There are three distinct ways in which this progressive weakening of centralized control has made itself felt. First, the Party shows some signs of falling back into the slough from which it was rescued by the masterful genius of Parnell. Its personnel has deteriorated. Of the eighty-odd Nationalist M.P.'s in the House of Commons about sixty-five are mere ciphers, of little account in their own constituencies, and of none at all at Westminster except as voting-machines. In many ways I greatly admire and sympathize with the Irish Party. They are brilliant Parliamentarians. Both as orators and as tacticians they are superior, far superior, to any other group in the House of Commons. Although the majority of them are poor men, who could not live in London unless their expenses were paid for them, no breath of corruption has ever touched their honor. They hold rigidly aloof from the wild scramble for Government patronage. Although often torn by personal feuds, they manage on the whole, and against inconceivable odds, to preserve a unity that is little less than marvellous, and they have learned with consummate dexterity how to extract the last ounce of advantage from their position of independence varied by occasional and temporary alliances. Their life can hardly be an enjoyable one. They are in the House, but not of it. They feel and proclaim themselves a foreign body in its composition. With ninety per cent. of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subjects on which it legislates, they feel no concern whatever; and the one subject which engrosses them has long since revolted the House. Parliament is sick of Ireland, and the great debates on Irish affairs that read so well when reported *verbatim* in the Irish papers take place for the most part in an empty, yawning Chamber. To enliven its proceedings with scenes of violence and obstruction, to degrade and stultify the assembly they cannot master, to sting and outrage and gibe at English sentiment and prejudices is, after all, a tedious and unproductive form of vengeance or consolation. It cannot reconcile Irish Nationalists to being exiles in an alien Parliament where they are hopelessly outnumbered, always in opposition, and rather openly despised and disliked, or to being surrounded by a resplendent society in which they have no part, or to fighting year after year towards a goal that seems ever to recede. On the whole, I do not know of a political existence more discouraging, irksome and wearing than that of the Irish Party in London.

For these reasons and for many others, I feel, as I have said, admiration and sympathy for the Irish Nationalists. But I cannot on that account, or because their ultimate aim has my entire approval, hide from myself that the last fifteen years have witnessed a steady decline in the personal and representative character of the Irish M.P.'s. Men have been foisted upon the Party who, in their heart of hearts, do not care twopence about Home Rule and who represent the local publican, money-lender or priest far more faithfully than they represent the National cause. The more vigorous and stalwart Nationalists in Ireland intensely resent the degree to which the Party has fallen under the domination of these undesirable elements. The Catholic Church, the saloon-keeper and the gombeen-man pull the strings to which Mr. Redmond dances; and their henchmen in the Party, while contributing nothing to the National cause, are instant and virulent in their opposition to anything that trenches on the clerical control of education, or on the interests of the liquor trade, or on the tyranny which the money-lender exercises over almost the whole of rural Ireland. That many of them are far from conforming to the English notions of what a "gentleman" should be is a very minor defect. It is a more serious disadvantage, but rather, I think, their misfortune than their fault, that they should be fitted neither by education nor experience nor inclina-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion for any kind of politics higher than those of the committee-room and the monster meeting. But it is altogether Ireland's own doing if she sends to represent her at Westminster men whom she would not only never dream of electing to a Home-Rule Parliament in Dublin, but who habitually place the interests of their own special trade or creed or class above the interests of the country as a whole, and whose devotion to Home Rule is of the lip merely. It is the presence of too many men of this stamp in the Irish ranks that partly explains why the Nationalists seem to be gathering next to no recruits among the rising generation. The Party leaders of a decade and a half ago are the Party leaders to-day. The land is almost bare of coming men. The youth and energy of Ireland are pouring themselves into other and rival channels. Their heart is no longer in the official programme. They are coming to look upon the Nationalist leaders rather as play-actors provided for their diversion than as the protagonists of a great national cause. The Party needs new blood, if only to give the country something fresh to think about, but the new blood is gravitating towards Sinn Féin, so far as it is gravitating towards anything, and the familiar leaders, with their familiar speeches and their familiar tactics, are beginning to grow monotonous. All that is most earnest and hardy in the Irish people is in revolt against thimble-rigging politics, is realizing that there is more to be done in Ireland than at Westminster, and is discovering, for the first time in Irish history, that politics, after all, are but an incomplete expression of a nation's totality.

One of the results of this loss of popular interest in the Irish Party is that there is an ever-increasing difficulty in raising funds. O'Connell, who organized a far more powerful movement than Mr. Redmond or Mr. Dillon will ever be able to inspire, supported it entirely by Irish contributions. The leaders of the Party to-day are forced more and more to sponge on America and Australia for the means to carry on their work. As a consequence, we are presented with the amazing spectacle of eighty members of the British House of Commons drawing their inspiration, and to a very large extent their sustenance, from sympathizers in a foreign land, who know very little about Ireland, who are in no way responsible for its welfare, and whose generous but mistaken assistance has the effect of shifting the centre of gravity of the Irish movement from Ireland itself to another country and of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relieving the Irish people from the necessity of thinking and acting for themselves and of bearing the expense of their own political work. It is a burden that Ireland is perfectly competent to shoulder without extraneous aid. The pronounced unwillingness of the Irish people to finance the National cause out of their own pockets is not due to any lack of money. The number of professed Nationalists in the country can hardly be less than three millions. I am willing, for the purposes of this argument, to write two-thirds of them off the list as non-effectives. That would leave a million convinced Home-Rulers. If each of them were to subscribe to the Party funds a sum of twenty-five cents a year an annual income of $250,000 would be the result; and this amount would be amply sufficient to provide for the support of all the Nationalist M.P.'s and leave a handsome margin for the purposes of propaganda. I repeat that the Irish people have the money. There are at this moment some $300,000,000 on deposit in the joint-stock banks, the post-office and the savings-banks of Ireland. The imports and exports of the country fall little short of $600,000,000. The Irish spend about seventy million dollars every year on drink and some seventeen million dollars every year on tobacco, and there always appears to be plenty of loose cash when it comes to a question of horse-racing or of building a new church. Yet they are so niggardly in the support of the cause of Nationalism that their leaders have to tramp the world, cap in hand, begging for the means to carry on their propaganda.

This is a curious and significant phenomenon. It raises in an acute form the doubt that always assails the dispassionate inquirer into Irish affairs, the doubt as to how far the Irish people really care for Home Rule. I believe it was Lord Dufferin who remarked that the Irish did not know what they wanted and would never be happy until they got it. There are many senses in which the epigram still holds good. The Irish suffer from a clumsy, extravagant and, above all, anti-national and unsympathetic government; and that is a genuine grievance. But I have never been able to detect among them any of the fierce spirit of an oppressed people struggling to be free. They show none of the determination of the Poles or the Finns. They enlist in the British army and make unsurpassable soldiers. The Royal Irish Constabulary is the most abused, but at the same time the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most popular of British institutions in Ireland; and practically the whole of its rank and file is composed of Catholics and Nationalists. If Ireland is really enslaved, it looks as though Irishmen take an unnecessarily active part in forging and riveting the fetters. They proclaim themselves the eternal enemies of the British Empire, yet they fight its battles and extend its dominions. They pose before the world as a nation held down by force, but at the same time it is they themselves who supply the bulk of the recruits for the army of subjugation. They insist that they have a distinct nationality of their own, yet they have voluntarily allowed themselves to become almost wholly Anglicized in speech, dress, manners and recreations. With an endless flow of rhetoric, they reiterate that nothing but Home Rule will satisfy them, yet they hand over to Americans and Australians the irksome duty of financing the agitation that presumably lies so near their hearts. What is one to make of all these contradictions? Is it that Home Rule appeals to the Irish merely as a nebulous sentiment, and that their patent reluctance to sacrifice anything for it gives the measure of its essential hollowness? I confess I do not know. I merely observe the historical fact that the demand for Home Rule only became really formidable when it was linked on to the agrarian agitation. The land-hunger of the peasantry has unquestionably furnished the motive power of the movement for political autonomy. That land-hunger is now at last by way of being appeased. Will Home Rule, deprived of what, for thirty years and more, has been its life-blood, be able to stand alone? Has it sufficient innate vitality to hold its own when divorced from the question of the land? Does the pacification of the peasantry mean the increasing depletion of the Nationalist exchequer and the increasing attrition of interest in the Home-Rule movement? Will the new proprietors of the soil, having obtained all that is obtainable out of political agitation, proceed to button up their pockets and attend to business? That is, indeed, the question of questions, and I know of nothing more fascinating than to speculate, with Irish history in one's mind, on the probable influence of a peasant proprietary upon the social, religious and political life of the country. A certain partial light has, perhaps, already been thrown upon it. To the innumerable faction-fights that add relish to Irish existence there has, at any rate, been added this one—of peasants who are still

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tied to dual ownership, seeking, with stones and shillalahs, to force their neighbors who have purchased, under the Wyndham Act, to continue subscribing to the United Irish League.

But for the present Mr. Redmond and his followers remain—it is their greatest asset—the Party in possession. Their organization, the United Irish League, has nearly fifteen hundred branches throughout the country and is in many ways a stronger power than the British Government itself. It keeps the agitation alive, holds public meetings, circulates resolutions on all conceivable topics, attends to the capture of the local government bodies and, above all, settles the agrarian code and policy of each district—decides, that is to say, who is to be boycotted, whose cattle is to be driven, and who is entitled to the first farm that falls vacant. Ireland, one must always remember, is a country not of individuals, but of cliques, factions and committees; and the struggle of hostile groups to get control of the local branch of the League and use it as an instrument of intimidation and persecution is of far more interest to the people than the question of Home Rule. There is a sense in which Ireland may be compared with Macedonia. The Macedonian problem underwent two phases. In the first phase, the Turks preyed on the Christians; in the second, the Christians preyed on one another. So in Ireland the old conflict between the Catholic, Irish and Nationalist tenant and the Protestant and English landlord has pretty well ended; and in its place has arisen a bitter internecine warfare among the Irish themselves, a warfare in which the contestants on each side seek to turn the power of the United Irish League against their enemies. Where agrarian peace has been established, where the tenants of the old days have become proprietors, and where, in consequence, men of some independence are to be found, the League has little influence. But where conditions are still unsettled, where, for instance, a man is in possession of a farm from which the former tenant was evicted, or where, as is the case throughout large areas in the West, wretched and uneconomic holdings lie in the immediate neighborhood of vast, untilled grazing-lands, there the League is still a formidable instrument of agitation, of petty tyranny and of social unrest. The control of such an organization is, of course, of supreme value to the Irish Party. Then, again, as I have said, Mr. Redmond and his followers have the money. The bulk of it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comes from America and Australia, and the comparatively small sum that is raised in Ireland is collected by the priests, who exact full payment for their services. You can always tell the state of the Irish Party's funds by watching the degree of its subserviency to the Church. When America is generous, the Party will venture on a little whirl of independence. When the exchequer is low, it has no option but to come, however reluctantly, to the clerical heel. I shall have occasion later on to touch upon the relations between Irish Nationalism and the Catholic hierarchy. Here I will merely note that, while the Nationalists are jealous of the Church, and while the Church distrusts the Nationalists, neither side dare risk an open rupture. For the Party to break with the Church would be to invite self-destruction. For the Church to break with the Party would be to throw away a weapon it has hammered into malleability. The destruction of the Irish Party would mean the instant rise of a more stalwart organization little inclined to take its cue from the priesthood; and Mr. Redmond can only quarrel with the Church at the risk of cutting off the flow of Irish subscriptions and committing himself to a fierce and doubtful struggle. Church and Party, though without enthusiasm, support and uphold each other from motives of self-interest. You are always expecting the explosion which never comes.

And besides the organization, the money and the Church, the Irish Party has the people behind it, or at least the majority of them. That is to say, in nearly every part of the country Mr. Redmond and his followers can still be sure of a huge audience, flamboyant resolutions, a welcome of banners and brass-bands and an infinity of cheering. The Irish people revel in such demonstrations. "In a land," said a candid Nationalist recently, "where there are so few amusements, where the theatre and the ball and the concert are regarded as being certainly dangerous and in all probability sinful, the tours of the Parliamentary Party contribute not a little to introduce a much-needed element of gayety into the national life. Redmond and his merry men are to Ireland very much what Thespis and his must-smeared mummers were to the inhabitants of old Attica." It is an old story that the average Irishman's idea of Paradise is an endless monster meeting in the Valley of Jehoshaphat. There is something in such gatherings and their accompaniments that he finds peculiar-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly grateful to his sensibilities. Not only are they the only national sport that he practises, but they make an irresistible appeal to his emotionalism and his sense of dramatic effect. It is, in fact, in the spirit of an unjaded playgoer at a first night's performance that he assists at them. He goes to be excited and entertained, to lose himself in a pleasurable succession of thrills, to meet his friends and be stimulated with them. He will pass whatever resolution is presented to him in a roar of cheers, but that he should be expected to act on it simply does not occur to him. Language in Ireland means a very different thing from language in any other country with which I am acquainted; it is an end in itself. The people have scarcely the rudiments of political education; volubility of speech goes hand in hand with the repression of all independent thought; and no clap-trap is too hollow for an Irish audience to accept with avidity. The mere fact, therefore, that the Irish Party is still able to hold enthusiastic meetings over most of the country argues little or nothing as to the degree of earnestness and conviction among the common people. It has, however, its value in making good the Party's claim to be, ostensibly at any rate, the acknowledged representative of Irish Nationalism. I do not see how this claim can be disputed. The Irish Party, so far as my powers of observation go, are in no serious danger of being ousted. The break that the Sinn Féiners have made in their ranks is as yet so slight as to be almost imperceptible. From the open attack of rival Nationalist bodies, either more extreme or more moderate than themselves, Mr. Redmond and his followers seem to me, on the whole, fairly secure. Nevertheless, dissatisfaction with them is wide-spread, and new conditions have arisen and new influences are at work which cannot but greatly modify their policy and conduct.

First, as I have said, there are the Sinn Féiners who advocate the complete withdrawal of the Irish M.P.'s from Westminster, and belabor the Party at least as heartily as the Party itself belabors the British Government. The Sinn Féin policy is doubtless impracticable, and even if it were practicable I question whether the Irish have the virility to adopt and stand by it. But the Sinn Féin spirit of individualism and self-reliance is gaining ground everywhere, and the Sinn Féin conception of a higher and all-embracing nationality is also gathering in its con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

verts. Thus, an atmosphere is being propagated that is fundamentally hostile to the idea of a pledge-bound, mechanical, arbitrary Party and to the gasconading resolutions, the stifling of private thought, the enforcement of a made-to-order mob-opinion, and the other ingenious and demoralizing methods of organized terrorism by which that Party carries on its propaganda. All that is most vigorous and aggressive in Irish Nationalism revolts against the Party's compliance with clerical demands and against the foreign subsidies that enable it to stand between the Irish people and the genuine, self-contained and constructive Home-Rule movement which, but for the politicians, would assuredly be evoked. The Irish Party has always confounded Nationalism with politics and has always dubbed as anti-national those who did not subscribe to its own political formulæ. The new Ireland relegates politics to a secondary place, works for a union of all classes, creeds and parties, and welcomes everything, from whatever source, that contributes to Irish well-being. The Irish Party has consistently acted on the principle that the salvation of Ireland is to be wrought by speeches and manœuvres in the House of Commons; it has neglected the intellectual, moral and economic progress of the country in order to concentrate all its strength on the constitutional panacea; it has denied that Ireland could be prosperous without Home Rule, and it has opposed and condemned every effort to make her prosperous as an act of treason to the national cause. The new Ireland, on the other hand, relies for the regeneration of the country and its people upon the practical work of Irishmen in Ireland, scouts the notion that the Irish question is a question of politics merely, and insists that the task of betterment shall be no longer postponed till an Irish Parliament is able to take it in hand. Thus the Irish Party has contrived to separate itself at more than one point from the best Irish thought. It has no solution to propose except politics and agitation for the thousand and one problems that the creation of a peasant proprietary has called into being; and it continues to display an unremitting jealousy of every non-partisan effort to promote the welfare of the new order. The policy of the Irish Nationalists has, indeed, been little less sterile, sectional and negative than the policy of the Irish Unionists. They have made no attempt to conciliate Ulster, and they have shown a misunderstanding of the English nature and character

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hardly less complete than the English misunderstanding of the Irish nature and character. They have always, for instance, refused to define what it is they mean by Home Rule or to put forward any scheme as a basis for discussion; and their policy of gloating over British disasters and of making provocation and *intransigeance* the key-note of their political conduct has been precisely the policy most calculated to confirm and irritate the prejudices of the English public.

In Ireland itself, they are played upon, now as ever, by two impulses and confronted by two alternatives. On the one hand, the dying out of the land war, the exhaustion, disillusionment and indifference of the masses threaten to rob the National movement of its old driving power. On the other hand, the new turn of the Irish mind towards the material and constructive, the new sense of nationality and interdependence, the gradual but sustained approximation of all Irishmen towards a common centre, summon all who profess to be the representatives of the Irish people to the accomplishment of a more vigorous, a more practical, a more self-reliant programme. The shortcomings, blunders and weaknesses of the Irish Party are obvious enough. But it must not be forgotten that on the main question it is they, and not their Unionist opponents, who are in the right, and that their ultimate aim, so far as it involves a radical change in the system and spirit of English rule in Ireland and directly associates the Irish people with the management of their own affairs, is the aim of an enlightened statesmanship. If the Irish Nationalists will only recognize that to further every project of internal amelioration and to widen their definition of nationality till it embraces all Irishmen is not only perfectly compatible with that aim, but helps to justify it, all may yet be well with them. I do not in any case expect to see them disappear from the political arena. Even if there were nothing else, enough of the agrarian problem still remains unsettled to furnish them with fuel for agitation on the old lines for several years to come. But unless they respond to the new and vital movements that are stirring Irish life and thought, they will cease with an increasing celerity to be the representatives of the Irish people, the life will have gone out of them, and they will be pushed aside for men of wider vision and more enduring purpose. SYDNEY BROOKS.

(To be Continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EVOLUTION OF DRAMATIC TECHNIQUE.

BY ARCHIBALD HENDERSON.

In the contemporary dramatic movement, nothing is more certain than the uncertainty of criticism in regard to the fundamental structure of a work of dramatic art. The iconoclasm of modern dramatic practice has been vastly unsettling in destroying old superstitions and inaugurating new heresies. English dramatic criticism in the closing half of the nineteenth century achieved notoriety, rather than notability, for its failure to recognize the great modern masters in drama for our epoch—Ibsen and Wagner. This failure arose because Ibsen and Wagner violently broke with the traditions; and, even in doing so, they set a standard of rigor and craftsmanship seldom, if ever, equalled upon the ancient stage. There is always something of the iconoclast in the genius: the iconoclast and the reformer are phases of one and the same life. It is often the case that greatness does not consist simply in doing what other people have done and doing it better: efficiency might better describe Emerson's ideal. Genius consists in doing what no one else has ever done before, and setting new standards for posterity to formulate. "The greatest artist," as Bernard Shaw says, "is he who goes a step beyond the demand, and by supplying works of a higher beauty and a higher interest than have yet been perceived, succeeds, after a brief struggle with its strangeness, in adding this fresh extension of sense to the heritage of the race."*

It is no less true of drama than of any other form of art that its laws are not abstract principles dogmatically enunciated by the greatest and most authoritative critics. On the contrary,

* "A Degenerate's View of Nordau"; Liberty, New York, July 27th, 1895.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these "laws" are generalizations from study and analysis of all extant works of dramatic art. True drama springs from the inner essential necessity of the dramatic artist for creative self-expression, and not from any motive, however laudable and worthy, to conform to classical traditions or to adapt one's self to current taste. Oscar Wilde was quite right in the assertion that the public is not the munificent patron of the artist, but that the artist is the munificent patron of the public. For too long, dramatic critics have been "telling a lie in a heroic couplet":

> "The drama's laws the drama's patrons give;
> And those who live to please must please to live."

That fresh extension of sense to the heritage of the race, of which Shaw speaks, is the contribution of neither critic nor public, but of the creative artist himself. The "laws" of the drama are the integrations of the practice of all dramatists, past and present. Every great pioneer in drama necessarily causes some modification, some recodification, of the "laws" of that art.

The way-breaker in art, it must be granted, is at once disciple and master of his age—disciple, because he must study and realize his age in order to be its interpreter and exponent; master, because he imparts to his artistic product something personal, incommunicable, inalienable—and thereby dominates the thought of his contemporaries. The evolutional trend of all art, imaginative and realistic, renders it imperative for the dramatist to make himself conversant with—which is not at all the same thing as slavishly subservient to—the prevailing conditions of his art as practised by his fellow craftsmen. If the dramatist purports to be the brief and abstract chronometer of the time he must, of course, take account of all that has been done before him, reaping the benefit of both past progress and present innovation. "We shall find, I think," says Arthur Wing Pinero, "that the drama is not stationary but progressive. By this I do not mean that it is always improving; what I do mean is that its conditions are always changing, and that every dramatist whose ambition it is to produce live plays is absolutely bound to study carefully the conditions that hold good for his own day and generation."*

* "Robert Louis Stevenson, the Dramatist; The Critic": New York, April, 1903.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this present day, when such practical scientists as Hugo de Vries and Luther Burbank have shown that evolution frequently proceeds, not by infinitely slow processes extending through æons of time, but by sudden and startling mutations, one need not be surprised to find verificative analogues in the domain of art and letters. Indeed, the history of the drama significantly indicates that its evolution has frequently operated through sudden mutations at periods when the drama flourished as the most potent of the forms of literary art. The history of drama is made up both of the biographies of great men and of the biographies of great movements—direct and spontaneous outbursts of creative energy. The drama has been defined as the meeting-place of life and art; and hence one need not be surprised to discover that the drama is as mutable as the conditions of the civilization which gives it birth. Aristophanes knew as little of the captain of industry as Shakespeare knew of wireless telegraphy or Molière of Darwinism. It would have been as impossible for Calderon to write a "Ghosts" or "A Waste" as it would be to-day for Bernard Shaw to say what society will be like under Socialism—should it ever come!

It is no matter for surprise, then, that plays, like people, have a way of ageing. The artist of one age is the artisan in the view of the next. The rigid conventions of one period of art culture become the threadbare conventionalities of a more advanced epoch. Customs, manners and even morals all become obsolete in the course of time. Human nature, essential virtue, alone remains the same. "*Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*" is an aphorism that breaks down in the drama in its structural and external aspects. The face of society and the conventions of technique are perpetually changing and remaining changed. Plays begin to "date" deplorably after a certain length of time.

"Everything has its own rate of change. Fashions change more quickly than manners, manners more quickly than morals, morals more quickly than passions, and, in general, the conscious reasonable life more quickly than the instinctive, wilful, affectionate one. The dramatist who deals with the irony and humor of the relatively durable sides of life, or with their pity and terror, is the one whose comedies and tragedies will last longest—sometimes so long as to lead a book-struck generation to dub him 'Immortal'; and proclaim him as 'not for an age, but for all time.'"—"The Second Dating of Sheridan: Dramatic Opinions and Essays." By G. Bernard Shaw, Vol. II, p. 29.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In precisely the same way the fundamental outlook of the drama, its *Ausschauung,* if I may so express it, undergoes alteration in the course of time through the influence of the evolutionary trend of human ideals. So also the *métier* of the drama may alter in character through the propulsive effect of evolutionary art ideals. The *œuvre à thèse* of a Brieux is as foreign to the age of Corneille as the democratic art of Tolstoy to the Elizabethan era. Moreover, the conventions of the drama are perpetually undergoing mutations of a more or less revolutionary character. The rules which bound Shakespeare do not impose upon Ibsen; the term *"la pièce bien faite,"* once a phrase to conjure with, has now become a term virtually depreciative and condemnatory. "Nowadays an actor cannot open a letter or toss off somebody else's glass of poison," Bernard Shaw remarks, "without having to face a brutal outburst of jeering!"

In the light of modern criticism, it is quite obvious that Aristotle wrote for his own epoch, not for ours. Indeed, it is a question whether he was final in his "Poetics," even for his own epoch. In the time of Corneille, the *odium dramaticum* burned almost as fiercely as the *odium theologicum.* No dramatist was given the critical *imprimatur* who did not conform to the "three unities." The curious circumstance in connection with this practice of the French and the Italians is that, whereas they supposed they were imitating the ancients, as a matter of fact the unities of time and place were not erected into principles by the Greek tragic dramatists. In his "Poetics," Aristotle rightly insists upon the one indispensable unity—unity of action; but he actually does not lay down the preservation of the unities of time and place as fundamental laws of the drama. Unity of place is not touched upon in his "Poetics"; and his disquisitions upon unity of time are merely his observations drawn from a study of the habitual practice of the ablest dramatists who flourished up to his time. From the philosophic and ethical side the crude notion of poetic justice has given place to an infinitely more human, if less artificially symmetrical, scheme of things. Only in melodrama, in the absolute sense, does this system of graded rewards and punishments still rankly flourish.

Gustav Freytag, the great modern authority upon dramaturgics, wrote his "Technique of the Drama" nearly half a century ago. The importance of this simple statement lurks in the fact that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this one great modern standard was written before Henrik Ibsen had produced his wonderful social dramas of modern life. Hauptmann and Sudermann had not written one of their studies of modern society which, since Ibsen's death, place them at the summit of contemporary dramatic art. Wilde and Shaw, as children, were playing, care-free, in Dublin; Rostand and Hervieu were babes; while Maeterlinck and Barker were yet unborn.

The questions, technical and dramaturgic, raised by the persistent practice of dramatists since the middle of the last century, demand conscientious solution at the hands of contemporary students of the drama. New ideas have forced their way to the front; new forms of art have left their distinctive impress upon the stage; new dramatic conventions have replaced the outworn conventionalities of an earlier epoch. The pressure of realism and the impulsive thrust of the new social order have basically affected the tenor and structure of the drama. The psychology of the crowd helps us to understand more clearly the secrets of popular appeal. The architectural features of the modern playhouse are not without their subtle influence in separating even more irrevocably play from public, actors from audience. Gone is the tennis-court stage of the Grand Monarque, gone the court-yard stage of Shakespeare, gone even the semicircular platform of half a century ago. To-day the illusion of objectivity is immense: we gaze through a picture-frame encircling the farce or the melodrama, the comedy or the tragedy, of this our time. When we enter that palace of light and sound, the theatre, we become innocent accessories after the fact to all that goes on before us in a room of which one wall has been removed.

It is high time—not to retrace our steps, for there can be no turning back,—but to orient ourselves and to take stock of our present status. Many arresting and disquieting problems to-day press for solution; and while Steiger, Volkeldt, Brunetière, Sarcey, Faguet, Walkley, Archer, Shaw and Matthews have written much, and ably, concerning the technique of the drama, Freytag's successor has not yet appeared to justify to the artistic, the critical and, one may even add, the scientific conscience, the most modern forms of dramatic art. It may not be amiss to indicate, quite briefly, the principal questions of technique in the contemporary drama which press for adequate treatment in terms of evolutionary and constructive criticism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First of all, the actual subject-matter of drama has taken the color of the age in which we live; and we must not forget that all technical questions ultimately depend upon the materials with which the dramatist works. The modern era, with its levelling democracy, its social accent, its preoccupation with the affairs of the average man, its discovery of the miracle of the commonplace, has ushered into the drama an entirely new range of subjects. In the drama of the past the personages and events treated were distinctly aristocratic in nature. Nobility of character was identified—or confused?—with nobility of rank. Great events were universally associated with people of high station. In Whitman's view, Shakespeare was pre-eminently the poet of courts and princes; and Ernest Crosby made quite clear the attitude of Shakespeare toward the working-classes. To-day, that "literature of the centre" of which Matthew Arnold spoke seems to be giving way more and more to the literature of the circumference. The old notion still persists in many quarters; and we find even so stimulating a critic as Mr. W. L. Courtney saying:

"There may be tragedies in South Hampstead, although experience does not consistently testify to the fact; but, at all events, from the historic and traditional standpoint, tragedy is more likely to concern itself with Glamys Castle, Melrose Abbey, Carisbrooke, or even with Carlton House Terrace."*

The charge triumphantly urged against Ibsen by "the old guard," headed by Clement Scott, is that he is provincial, parochial, suburban; that he deals with ordinary people and everyday life; that he has definitively doffed the purple pall of tragedy. In this assertion inheres the secret of Ibsen's distinction, the note of his social dramas of modern life. As Bernard Shaw says:

"Suburbanity at present means modern civilization. The active, germinating life in the households of to-day cannot be typified by an aristocratic hero, an ingenuous heroine, a gentleman forger abetted by an Artful Dodger, and a parlor maid who takes half-sovereigns and kisses from the male visitors. Such interiors exist on the stage and nowhere else. . . . But, if you ask me where you can find the Helmer household, the Allmers household, the Solness household, the Rosmer household, and all the other Ibsen households, I reply, 'Jump out of a train anywhere between Wimbledon and Haslemere, walk into the first villa you come to, and there you are.' . . . This suburban life, except in so far as it is totally vegetable and undramatic, is the life depicted

* "The Idea of Tragedy." By W. L. Courtney, p. 122.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Ibsen. Doubtless some of our critics are quite sincere in thinking it a vulgar life, in considering the conversations which men hold with their wives in it improper, in finding its psychology puzzling and unfamiliar, and in forgetting that its bookshelves and its music-cabinets are laden with works which did not exist for them, and which are the daily bread of young women educated very differently from the sisters and wives of their day. No wonder they are not at ease in an atmosphere of ideas and assumptions and attitudes which seem to them bewildering, morbid, affected, extravagant and altogether incredible as the common currency of suburban life. But Ibsen knows better. His suburban drama is the inevitable outcome of a suburban civilization (meaning a civilization that appreciates fresh air); and the true explanation of Hedda Gabler's vogue is that given by Mr. Grant Allen: 'I take her in to dinner twice a week.'"*

The drama typical of our day is *bourgeois* in character, dealing with the thoughts and passions, the loves and hates, the comedies and tragedies, of the sort of people we meet every day on the street. They are people with like passions as ourselves, and the incidents of their lives are constantly being reproduced around us in real life. The influence of the first truly realistic novels, dealing with the affairs of people quite commonplace in every respect, save that of human interest or moral passion, was gradually felt in the sphere of the drama.† The pedestrian realism and middle-class preoccupations of Richardson, of Fielding, of Rousseau set up a movement in fiction which first met acceptance in the drama at the hands of Diderot, and found further and higher development through the instrumentality of Dumas *fils*, Augier, Ibsen, Björnsen and the modern school of playwrights. The anecdotes and adventures which constitute the material of the earlier drama have lost their hold upon the modern world because they no longer furnish us that thrill of immediate actuality, that vital interest of contemporaneous circumstance, which live only in the atmosphere of to-day. As Maeterlinck says:

"Consider the drama that actually stands for the reality of our time, as Greek drama stood for Greek reality, and the drama of the Renaissance for the reality of the Renaissance. Its scene is a modern house; it passes between men and women of to-day. The names of the invisible protagonists—the passions and ideas—are the same, more or less, as of old. We see love, hatred, ambition, jealousy, envy, greed; the sense

* "*Little Eyolf: Dramatic Opinions and Essays.*" By G. Bernard Shaw, Vol. II, pp. 106–107.

† Compare "Modern Social Drama as Influenced by the Novel." By W. L. Courtney, "The Eclectic Magazine," Third Series, Vol. VIII.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of justice and idea of duty; pity, goodness, devotion, piety, selfishness, vanity, pride, etc. But, although the names have remained more or less the same, how great is the difference we find in the aspect and quality, the extent and influence, of these ideal actors! Of all their ancient weapons not one is left them, not one of the marvellous moments of olden days. It is seldom that cries are heard now; bloodshed is rare, and tears not often seen. It is in a small room, round a table, close to the fire, that the joys and sorrows of mankind are decided. We suffer or make others suffer; we love, we die, there in our corner; and it were the strangest chance should a door or a window suddenly, for an instant, fly open beneath the pressure of extraordinary despair or rejoicing."*

The natural corollary to the suburbanization of the drama is the degeneration of the hero. Instead of the hero of the past conquering every foe, we have to-day the hero *manqué,* struggling with fatal futility against the overwhelming pressure of environment, the brand of heredity, the coil of circumstance, the chains of character, the damning verdict of self-mockery and self-contempt. According to the critical canons of the past, the hero must be a person of consideration, of distinction—"an ideal character in an ideal situation," to use the ridiculous phrase. The solution already to hand was to make the hero a person of exalted rank. This was the doctrine of at least two centuries of criticism—the doctrine of Corneille, of D'Aubignac, of Racine, of Voltaire, of Dacier, of Sir Philip Sydney. It is as important as ever that the protagonist should be distinctive, in some way set apart from the common herd, whether through surplus of human feeling, magnanimity of soul, profundity of passion or breadth of social instinct. But to-day the protagonist, in both novel and drama, has stepped down from the pedestal of the colossal; he has now "lost the last gleam from the sunset of the heroes." As Mr. Gilbert Chesterton has pointed out:

"Down to the time of Dickens, we have the first walking gentleman, the young man carrying with him a certain ancestral light and atmosphere of legend. And, about the time of Dickens's later work, that light fades into the light of common day. The first great creation of the new manner in England is the character of Arthur Pendennis. This is the young man lit from head to foot suddenly with the white light of realism, all the red lamps of legend being extinguished around him."†

So also in the drama, the leading male character—it would be profoundly absurd to dignify him with the title of "hero"—is

* "The Modern Drama": The Double Garden, by Maurice Maeterlinck, pp. 122–123.

† "The Young Man in Fiction"; "The Critic," August, 1903.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often little elevated above the level of the commonplace, and in many cases little more or less than a fraud, an impostor, a bounder or a cad. The moral predisposition of the dramatist often makes the protagonist a ridiculous, a pitiable or even a sinister figure, satirizing himself by outraging the conscience of the spectators every time he does his "duty." In a sense, Hamlet is a foreshadowing of the protagonist of ultra-modern drama; and in another generation, perhaps, dissatisfaction with conventional morality, tempered by improvement in ethical standards, will give place to individual moral dignity in the domain of the heroic. Stockmann swings too far away from Helmer, Marchbanks from Morell, Tanner from Ramsden; the contrasts are, psychologically, almost grotesque. Obsessed by polemical intent and reformatory zeal, the modern dramatist, from Ibsen to Shaw, has charged his product with mordant comic and tragic irony. The protagonist has lost his poise in the violence of his reaction; we either see him as a violent reactionary and headlong reformer, or observe him from the modern woman's point of view, catching "glimpse after glimpse of himself from this point of view himself, as all men are beginning to do more or less now, the result, of course, being the most horrible dubiety on his part as to whether he is really a brave and chivalrous gentleman or a humbug and a moral coward."

The hope for the hero of the drama of the future lies in the domain of moral psychology. In speaking of the protagonist of contemporary drama, Mr. W. L. Courtney has said:

"Instead of being a nobleman, or at least distinguished, he has become merely *bourgeois;* instead of knowing that whatever he suffers is accurately proportioned to his guilt, and that he is the victim of true poetic justice, he has become lost in mazes of indiscriminate action, succeeding and failing, he knows not why, subject to the most marvellous coincidences, 'a foiled, circuitous wanderer' in an unreasonable world."*

The modern "hero" is a failure, because he is frustrated on every hand by the savage irony of facts—the insufficiency of his moral code, the mockery of his introspection, the discrepancy between deductions and facts, the evils of contemporary society, the lethargy of civic conscience, the irresistible pressure of the social organism. Perhaps this bankruptcy of masculine heroism

* "Vicissitudes of the Hero in Drama"; "Eclectic Magazine," Third Series, Vol. VIII, p. 208.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may help to explain the fact that the truly heroic rôles in modern drama are played by women. With Mr. Chesterton, we may well look forward to that future work of genius which shall give us "a psychological Hercules," and "show us that there is potentially a rejection for every temptation, a mastery for every mischance, much as there is a parry for every stroke of the sword."

Not only is the hero shorn of his ancient attributes in modern drama; he is actually robbed of all the accessories which once went so far toward creating the illusion. The hero of romance accomplished miracles, performing unheard-of deeds of skill and daring; and he always spoke in the language befitting his station and his achievements. The protagonist of the modern drama is taken alive from the midst of modern life; his actions and his modes of expression are typical of this unromantic and unheroic age in which we live. Indeed, it is not inconceivable that Carlyle and Mommsen understood the ancient hero as typified in Julius Cæsar better than did either Plutarch or Shakespeare. As Mr. Forbes-Robertson asks, "Why should the hero of classical antiquity always be thought of as strutting around with arm extended, indulging in bombastic rant and spouting a lot of blank verse?" The modern drama is marked by that creeping paralysis of external action of which Maurice Maeterlinck speaks; the interpreter of contemporary life has discovered that a motive is as thrilling a dramatic theme as an action; and that passion is as vital in its repression as in its exhibition. The difference between the modern realists and the old epic poets, it has been pointed out, is the whole difference "between an age that fought with dragons and an age that fights with microbes." In this microbe-fighting age the protagonist is profoundly concerned with the importance of the trivial; and his language—often even his thought—barely suffices to elevate him above the mean level of the commonplace. The case for the modern dramatic realist is best put in that remarkable letter of Ibsen to Edmund Gosse, January 15th, 1874:

"You are of the opinion that the drama ought to have been written in verse, and that it would have gained by this. Here I must differ from you. The play is, as you must have observed, conceived in the most realistic style; the illusion I wished to produce was that of reality. I wished to produce the impression on the reader that what he was reading was something that had really happened. If I had employed verse,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I should have counteracted my own intention and prevented the accomplishment of the task I had set myself. The many ordinary, insignificant characters whom I have intentionally introduced into the play would have been indistinct and indistinguishable from one another, if I had allowed them to speak in one and the same rhythmical measure. We are no longer living in the days of Shakespeare. Among sculptors there the representation. My new drama is no tragedy in the ancient acceptation; what I desired to depict were human beings, and therefore I would not let them talk the 'language of the Gods.'"*

In Henrik Ibsen, among contemporary dramatists, the evolutional trend of technical process is most vividly defined. Discarding verse as the inevitable medium of modern thought, Ibsen sought to hammer the prose of our day into a weapon of the finest temper and highest efficiency. No one better than Ibsen himself realized how many innovations had to be made, how many obstacles overcome, how many conventions discarded. Steadily forging towards naturalness, ease, verisimilitude, Ibsen rejected with the utmost firmness approved classic models on the ground that they did not contribute towards the aims he had in view. Indeed, it was inevitable, once realism had gained a firm footing, that many of the artificial conventions of the past should ultimately be rejected by a generation which made naturalness the watchword and slogan of its art.

The drama, it need scarcely be remarked, involves nothing more nor less than a series of tacit agreements between actors and audience. The most objective, the most impersonal, of the arts by reason of its limiting conditions, the drama is, nevertheless, that is already talk of painting statues in the natural colors. I have no desire to see the Venus of Milo painted, but I would rather see the head of a negro executed in black than in white marble. Speaking generally, the style must conform to the degree of ideality which pervades fact, positively ignored; the illusion of reality is precluded by refusal to fall in with this necessarily mutual compact. This tacit conspiracy, if originally carried out in the proper spirit, becomes in course of time a totally unconscious process in the mind of the spectator. The moment one enters a theatre he beform of art which involves the greatest number of implied contracts. There is a tacit agreement between player and spectator comes a willing believer in the artificial operations of a mimic that certain flagrant breaches of veracity are to be winked at—in

* "Letters of Henrik Ibsen," edited by J. N. Laurvik, p. 269.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world, ruled by many laws and governed by many conventions, which do not obtain in the world of actuality. In making a bust of either Booker or George Washington, the sculptor feels free to use either white marble or bronze at his pleasure. The Wagnerian opera is written and composed about a race of beings whose only mode of vocal communication is that of song. Dramas in which all the characters speak in verse are, of course, from the realistic standpoint, manifest absurdities. Realism has its skilfully concealed conventions also; no race of people ever spoke as do the characters of Shaw and Ibsen—brilliant epigram, cogent argument, irrepressible dialectic, on the one hand, or perfection of condensation, appositeness and brevity, on the other.

Conventions which to a former age seemed indispensable to the stage and to the drama impress our generation as mere fashion. In his earlier plays, for example, Ibsen made use of a great many conventions, which his incorruptible sense of veracity led him to reject when he began to depict the life of his own age. Certain of these earlier plays are quite Scribelike in their artificiality; but his very first play in prose, "The League of Youth," although a "well-made piece," *par excellence,* after the Scribe formula, is a decisive step toward greater naturalness. To use Ibsen's own expression, its language gives it "strong, realistic coloring," and the whole play is carried through "without a single monologue—in fact, without a single aside." In this remark, I believe, Ibsen sounded the death-knell of the monologue, the soliloquy, the aside; and by his practice soon rendered ridiculous those dramatists who persisted in employing these devices.

Let us consider for a moment these curious survivals of a more formal, a more artificial, stage of the drama. To-day nothing shocks a sensitive critic—or, indeed, a self-respecting audience—more than to have to endure a play which opens by the descent of two persons to the footlights to carry on an expository conversation beginning, "It is now twenty-five years since, etc." I can still summon the feeling of profound disgust with which, as a boy of eight years of age, I witnessed the opening act of a dramatization of Rider Haggard's "She": two men sitting on a log for half an hour and telling half the story of the novel to put the audience *en rapport* with the situation! Equally unendurable to a modern audience is the device of the soliloquy or the monologue, serving as a sort of first aid to ignorant audiences.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From time immemorial, the soliloquy has been a favorite device of dramatists for putting the audience in close and immediate touch with the matter in hand; and it is a device which was once much relished by the auditor. In his "*Pratique du Théâtre*" the Abbé d'Aubignac confesses "that it is sometimes very pleasant to see a man upon the stage lay open his heart and speak boldly of his most secret thoughts, explain his designs and give a vent to all that his passion suggests." Examples of this means of self-revelation and self-betrayal are notable in the history of the drama: the "To be or not to be" of Hamlet, the self-condemnatory confessions of Iago, Wallenstein's mystic presages of impending disaster, Orgon's grotesque imaging of the deformities of his own soul, Brand's heart-cries of poignant passion. But it must be observed that the soliloquy has been used in the drama for two purposes: either to exhibit the soul-state of an harassed mortal under the stress of tremendous feeling, or else for the reprehensible end of acquainting the audience with certain facts indispensable to their comprehension of the plot. As a matter of fact, people sometimes—and not infrequently—do give audible expression to their thoughts and feelings when they are, or fancy themselves, alone. But the soliloquy of a sane man in actual life is of an exceedingly brief interval of time—a few words or, at most, a few sentences. The soliloquy in its crude form is discarded by the modern dramatist because it is an artificial device, scarcely having the justification of Queen Elizabeth's definition of a lie: "an intellectual means of avoiding a difficulty."

Dramatic craftsmanship has to-day reached a point of such complex excellence that the best dramatists refuse to employ so unworthy a device as the lengthy soliloquy: first, because it is fundamentally untrue to actual life; second, because it seeks to give information which may be more veraciously imparted in more natural ways. As Professor Matthews has pointed out, the soliloquy was more acceptable in the days of the "platform stage, with the characters ever in close contact with the spectators; but it is far less suitable for the playwright who works for the picture stage, whereon the characters are too far removed to be justified in making confidential communications to the audience."* And yet attention should be called to the fact that in the forthright

* "Concerning the Soliloquy," by Brander Matthews; Putnam's Monthly, November, 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dramas of to-day—from the farces of W. S. Gilbert and the comedies of Shaw to the tragi-comedies of Wedekind and the serious dramas of Ibsen—the characters speak out in the presence of their acquaintances with such astounding frankness, such boundless naïveté, that the harboring of secret thoughts seems almost to have disappeared in the economy of contemporary civilization. The soliloquy, save of very brief length and in exceptional cases, is no longer needed—especially by the advanced type of individual who prefers to tell everybody everything!

Allied to the device of the soliloquy is that of the confidant, who for long has been wont to share the secrets of the protagonist. Instead of speaking solely to himself—or to the audience if the illusion be shattered—the protagonist in this case confides his woes to a sympathetic listener. Frequently the confidant not only draws out the protagonist, but also grows quite communicative "off his own bat," thus materially furthering the action of the piece. By means of the confidant, as well as by means of the soliloquy, the audience is informed of many facts needful for a comprehension of the situation. As Sardou has confessed, the dramatist often finds himself controlled by the conditions of the situation which he projects; his only mode of escape is to have part of the plot, certain intervening links in the story, inserted through the intermediaries of confidences and personal confessions. The undisguised confidant, in the crudest form, is banished from the modern stage, because it is a spurious and oftentimes unnatural means of furthering the action of the piece. But it is quite unreasonable to suppose that the confidant, naturally presented, will ever disappear from the stage. The confidential friend is frequently portrayed by the rigorous craftsman, Ibsen—Mrs. Linden in "A Doll's House," Mrs. Elvsted in "Hedda Gabler," Dr. Herdal in "The Master Builder," and so on. Bernard Shaw, who has vigorously protested against "recklessness in the substitution of dead machinery and lay figures for vital action and real characters," employs the confidant, more or less thinly disguised, in several of his plays—Praed in "Mrs. Warren's Profession," McComas in "You Never Can Tell," Cokane in "Widowers' Houses." The rôle of confidential friend is a natural rôle played by almost every one every day of his life. Thousands of men and women in the world are peculiarly fitted by nature to play the part of confidant, and do actually go through

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

life playing practically nothing else.* The confidential friend will continue to play his part on the stage, so long as he is naturally presented, so long as his presence is integral and vital to the psychological processes of the action.

In notable modern dramas the rôles of *raisonneur,* of ideal spectator, of modernized, individualized Greek chorus, frequently appear. In the plays of Dumas *fils* the *raisonneur* plays a conspicuous part; in Ibsen we find this rôle played by Dr. Relling in "The Wild Duck," for example; in Sudermann's "*Die Ehre,*" Count Trast at times seems little more than an exposition of the author's meaning of the title. In Pinero's "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray," Cayley Drummle is a composite of confidant and individualized Greek chorus; while in Shaw's "John Bull's Other Island," Keegan is the ideal spectator pure and simple. In the majority of Shaw's plays some character seems to stand out as the expositor and interpreter of the author's views. These characteristic examples are cited to illustrate the fact that dramatic art has not yet learned to dispense with some variant form of the ideal spectator, call it by whatsoever name you will. The *raisonneur,* though modern in appearance, in reality is merely a survival of an ancient convention. It appears to be one of those conventions, almost structurally inherent in technical chirography, by which the dramatist meets the audience half-way in the task of interpretation. The *raisonneur* survives to-day, less as replica of contemporary humanity, than as symbol of the dramatist's personal struggle to obviate the extreme objectivity of drama. In an age of persistent propagandism the *raisonneur* typifies the polemical passion of modern thought.

The "stage aside," an even cruder form of technical device than either the soliloquy or the confidant, is now forever relegated to the limbo of threadbare stage properties. It is a sort of petty and bastard form of the soliloquy, serving either the serious purpose of discovering the intent of the character, or the comic purpose of betraying his naïveté or sense of humor. The "stage whisper" is as universal a mark for derision as the mother-in-law joke or the Burgessic "bromide"—and for no other reason than that it is absurdly unnatural, serving merely as a sort of "dead give away"—usually for comic effect. The "stage aside"

* In this connection compare "A Talk on Technique," by William Archer; The Tribune (London), May 18th, 1907.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

survives in the musical comedy, the farce, the melodrama and even in light operas such as those of Gilbert and Sullivan. But, like the soliloquy, the "stage aside" is condemned by the modern realist, who makes his characters utter aloud the daring iconoclasms, the mordant ironies, the solemn profundities which they would once have uttered *sotto voce*.

The lengthy soliloquy, the undisguised confidant and the stage aside have virtually been eliminated from the category of legitimate dramatic technique. Ibsen, the greatest technician of all, rejecting theatrical artifices and questionable conventions, achieved the most severely realistic transcripts of life by projecting situations, not as *manipulations*, but as *creations* of character—the inevitable events of an attitude towards life, a point of view, an *état d'âme*. With that peculiar and remarkable retrospective method of his invention, whereby Ibsen causes his plays to turn upon events supposed to have happened before the rise of the curtain, characters are developed in conflict, pitfalls discovered, motives unveiled and soul histories disclosed. And this achievement is effected without the employment of fraudulent devices by which earlier and less expert craftsmen endeavored to unroll the story. As Georg Brandes recently wrote:

"The most esteemed dramatists before him, such as Frederick Hebbel, came to be looked upon as his mere forerunners. The French dramatists, who in his youth were masters in the European theatres, became antiquated in presence of his art. With them there is still an intrigue in an antiquated form. Some one is made to believe something and reacts. Since the artificial intrigue in Ibsen's youthful play, 'Lady Inger,' such plots never more occur with him. From within, the characters are disclosed. A veil is lifted, and we notice the peculiar stamp of the personality. A second veil is lifted, and we learn its past. A third veil is lifted, and we catch a glimpse of its profoundest nature."

The great achievement of the modern dramatist, one might even say his great innovation, has been the identification of the *action* and the *exposition*. Hebbel, that profound student of dramatic art, recognized in the separation of the exposition and the action the principal barrier between art and life. In the works of the greatest modern dramatists the drama is an organic unit. No word is addressed directly to the public—"Peter Pan" to the contrary notwithstanding!—and the actors are definitely cut off from the audience by the insurmountable barrier of the picture-frame stage.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In fine, the drama of to-day, through the influences of modern democracy, of shifting moral values, of the critical rather than the worshipful attitude towards life, of an irresistible thrust towards increased naturalness and greater veracity, has become *bourgeois,* dealing with the world of *tous les jours;* comic, verging upon the tearful, or serious, trenching upon the tragic; unheroic, suburban and almost prosaic, yet vastly interesting by reason of its sincerity and its humanity; essentially critical in tone, proving all things, holding fast that which is good. The contemporary realist rejects the stage tricks which discredit the able craftsman—the lengthy soliloquy, the undisguised confidant, the stage aside; but still finds it unnecessary to dispense with the brief monologue, the confidential friend and the *raisonneur.* The symbolic phrase and the repetitive symbol are new and reputable variants of the mechanical catchword and the farcical "gag." Unity of action, alone of the three unities, is the indispensable unity; and there is no abstract or ideal justice to replace the poetic justice of a more mechanical epoch in art. Action and exposition are identical; and the modern drama concerns itself less with material action than with a minute and exhaustive consideration of the motives which prompt to action. If symbolism upon the one hand tends to cloud the scene, ample elucidative stage descriptions and directions tend vastly to clarify the intent of the author and the *rationale* of the piece. The influence of the picture-frame stage, making for increased objectivity, is offset by the continued recurrence of the personal equation. Rarer and rarer are becoming the "necessarily artificial poems that arise from the impossible marriage of past and present"; and in the future, reconstitution of past epochs, revitalization of historic episodes and characters, promise to be effected solely through the transmutative media of modern philosophy and contemporary thought. The humanizing influences of fraternal sympathy, of social pity and social justice are beginning to replace, in some measure, more personal and selfish interests. "There still remains in the depths of every heart of loyal intention," as Maeterlinck finely says, "a great duty of charity and justice that eclipses all others. And it is perhaps from the struggle of this duty against our egoism and ignorance that the veritable drama of our century shall spring."

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RELIGIO-MEDICAL MOVEMENTS.—A REPLY.

BY THE REV. SAMUEL McCOMB, D.D.

In the last issue of this Review, Dr. Allan McLane Hamilton discusses certain developments in the religious and intellectual life of this country, and more especially animadverts on a recent effort to bring into friendly alliance the resources of science and religion with a view to an increase in public well-being. Dr. Hamilton's well-known ability as an alienist and student of morbid mental states gave rise at once to the hope that some large and illuminating word would be spoken, and that his criticism would be marked by instruction and insight. I must confess that I finished the reading of the Doctor's article with a sense of profound disappointment.

To begin with, the tone of the discussion is open to grave criticism. One would expect that the writing of a man claiming to represent science would move in a high and serene atmosphere, far above the jealousies and wranglings of the market-place. One would expect that the argument would be impersonal, concerned strictly with the issues, and would be conducted with due regard to the amenities generally observed among educated men. Alas! this is not what we do find. Instead, contempt, scorn, thinly veiled sneers and bad temper are everywhere in evidence. It is most distressing to a scholar, who, though not a man of science in the narrow and conventional sense of the term, is nevertheless imbued with reverence for scientific method, to observe the incapacity of certain scientifically trained minds for dealing in a calm, dispassionate and judicial manner with any matter touching on religion.

The article seems to have been written without preparation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

except such as the perusal of newspapers might afford. It was apparently written without an adequate knowledge of the theological, scientific or social conditions of thought existing in New England. Dr. Hamilton stands before the public as a man of science. Now, the mind that is not merely conventionally and pedantically scientific, but that is penetrated by a genuinely scientific spirit, is able to differentiate between phenomena that present some superficial similarities, to trace each back to its roots, and to estimate each from the standpoint of reality and worth. But what method (it is certainly not scientific) does a writer follow who lumps together, as equally valuable products of culture, the transcendentalism of Emerson, hypnotism, electrobiology, telepathy, spiritism, the influence of mind over body, unconscious cerebration, the dual ego, Christian Science and the Emmanuel Movement? And how are we to regard the conclusions of one who sits down to write about a work which at least has gained the sympathy of many good and serious minds, without taking the trouble to acquaint himself with the explicit statement of principles and methods which the founders of the work have set forth in a well-known book?

In grouping together for comment Christian Science and the Emmanuel Movement, Dr. Hamilton employs a familiar rhetorical artifice, by which a writer pillories together two things, one of which is obnoxious to the public and the other obnoxious to himself, with the result that some share of the ignominy attaching to the first falls upon the second. In reality, the only point of contact between Christian Science and the Emmanuel Movement seems to lie in the fact that they both took rise in New England, and that they are both efforts in very different ways to bring to bear upon people the reality and significance of the spiritual world. In the first place, Christian Science, which I am not here defending or criticising, has openly and clearly broken with academic medicine; the Emmanuel Movement is a movement to dissipate the distrust of academic medicine which, as Professor Münsterberg has remarked in his book, "The Americans," is spreading throughout American society, and to ally the physician and the psychologically trained clergyman in friendly league against certain forms of trouble prevalent in our time, partly physical but mainly psychical and moral in character. In the second place, Christian Science is a distinct cult

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or system, with a revelation, a sacred book, a form of worship all its own; the Emmanuel Movement claims to have no new revelation, no sacred book, no worship peculiar to itself, but is simply a modest attempt to realize that religion which Dean Stanley used to call "our common Christianity," and to apply it more powerfully to our life in its various relations, physical economic, social and domestic. Thirdly, Christian Science makes no distinction between the cases with which it undertakes to deal —for the Christian Scientist, living in a world which is itself only a phantom, the terms "functional" and "organic" are meaningless; the Emmanuel Movement, on the other hand, makes a very rigid distinction, and sets aside distinctly organic cases for medical, physiological or surgical treatment, though even in these it recognizes the influence of mental and spiritual processes as at least helpful in character. Finally, the clergymen who are at the head of the Emmanuel Movement do not practise medicine, and would regard such a claim as an unwarrantable impertinence, if not something worse. They are not qualified for such work and therefore do not claim to perform it. As students of religion, however, they hold the key to many motives and primary emotions which exert a distinct influence on the mind and, through the mind, upon the body; and they believe that their knowledge and whatever measure of skill experience may have given them should be placed freely at the disposal of their fellow men. The average physician does not claim to be a teacher of ethics and religion; he does not profess to apply these to the needs of men. But we know to-day that there are many forms of disorder in which character is implicated. Every wise physician is aware that, if only he could reconstruct the character of his patient, if he could give his patient a more satisfactory moral or religious or philosophical outlook, he would set in motion psychical activities which would eventually restore the man to nervous health and equilibrium.

Now, it seems to us that a clergyman, properly trained, might be helpful to the physician in this direction. It is this modest, and not very dreadful, idea which lies at the basis of the Emmanuel work. To put the matter in a single sentence: *The fundamental idea of our effort is that of the co-operation of physician, psychologically trained clergyman and expert social worker, in the alleviation and cure of certain disorders of the*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nervous system that are now generally regarded as involving some weakness or defect of character, or a more or less complete mental dissociation.

It will be admitted that no one profession is able to cover the whole field of human relations, or competent to treat man on all sides of his being, physical, mental, moral, religious and social; and the Emmanuel plan is simply to bring together in friendly alliance specialists in these various departments, that they may the better help the individual to a normal and healthy life. Dr. Hamilton speaks slightingly of persons whom he calls "non-medical tyros," "doctor clerics," "clerical practitioners." I would commend to his attention the following remarks in an essay by Dr. James G. Mumford, a well-known Boston surgeon:*

"All surgeons have witnessed the fear which troubles grievously many courageous persons during a few hours immediately before an operation; and their dread especially of the ether or chloroform. . . . I have in mind the case of a woman upon whom I was to perform a serious and crippling operation. On the evening before her ordeal, her clergyman visited her. He was a man largely and intelligently interested in Religion and Medicine; and, at my request, he visited my patient to help her by suggestive treatment, as well as by the consolations of religion. The commonplace clergyman is a frequent and ineffective visitor under such circumstances; but, in this case, the treatment given was extremely effective; for the clergyman and his methods were not commonplace. The patient sank from an exalted state of terror and anxiety into a confident and tranquil mental condition; and, though she slept little during the night, she took her anesthetic; underwent the operation; and entered upon her convalescence with surprising calmness and success."

If I may be pardoned a personal reference, I may say that I have been asked by hospital authorities to visit sufferers unable to obtain sleep except by the use of powerful opiates or hypnotic drugs, in order to assist these persons to a state of mind conducive to rest. I have never felt that I ought to refuse these invitations as inconsistent with my spiritual functions.

When we come to the pith of Dr. Hamilton's contentions, we find that he professes to give an account of the origin of the Emmanuel idea; to convict its founders of contradicting their cherished principles by failing to recognize the difference between organic and functional diseases; and to give reasons for an out-and-out condemnation of hypnotism as a therapeutic agent.

* "Some End-Results of Surgery," p. 15.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His account of the origin of the work is purely imaginary and has no relation to fact. His charge that the Emmanuel leaders forsake scientific ground in failing to recognize the difference between "functional" and "organic" is based on a misconception, or rather on a careless reading of plain English. His argument about hypnotism, even if sound, is an irrelevance.

To begin with, as to the origin of the Emmanuel Movement: He traces it partly to the failure of the churches to attract adherents, in spite of offering "free baths, free lectures and other recreations," and partly to the "opposition of the powerful sect" of Christian Science. It would be hard to frame a statement more utterly alien to the facts. Emmanuel Church was and still remains one of the most powerful and one of the most active religious societies in New England. There was no need, therefore, for such a church to "look about for a new species of attraction," and to call in the "help of a few Boston physicians of a metaphysical and experimental turn of mind" in order that its lease of life might be renewed. As to the rivalry of Christian Science, Emmanuel Church, so far as I know, never lost one of its members to that communion. When Dr. Hamilton notices the remarkable increase in the membership of the Christian Science Church from 13,534 in June, 1904, to 43,876 in 1907, he does not pause to ask the meaning of such a phenomenon. It does not appear to him to be worth inquiring why such a thing should happen in the midst of an advanced civilization and in the light of the twentieth century. I commend this problem to his study at leisure movements; and I will simply add that, if the churches too often have been formal and unattractive, the science of medicine, in the hands of average physicians, has been not infrequently hidebound, professional and materialistic.

In contrast to the baseless figment of Dr. Hamilton's imagination, I will state in a few words the real genesis of our work. In the year 1905, we sought to contribute to the anti-tuberculosis crusade by a practical effort to solve this problem: How to cure the poorest consumptives in the slums of a great city without removing them from their homes? A Tuberculosis Class was formed under the direction of a distinguished medical authority. The treatment offered consisted of the most recent scientific method of combating consumption, along with the psychic forces of discipline, friendly encouragement, hope and material help—in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

short, a combination of physical, psychical and moral elements. This effort has been attended with the most gratifying success, and it is being followed in other places. It is significant that Cornet, in his monumental work on Tuberculosis, remarks that "a bad psychologist will never be a good physician for consumption."* At the International Tuberculosis Congress, held recently in Washington, a first award of a gold medal was given to the authorities in charge of this class; and Professor Osler, speaking of the class, said: "I know of no more encouraging feature in connection with the disease than this practical experiment, which has been carried out so successfully." Now, it was the success attending this work that led us to believe that the physician and the clergyman might be able to work together on behalf of the morally and nervously disordered. Accordingly, the work was begun under a double leadership, medical and clerical, and, as experience ripens our views and ideas, the co-operation between clergyman and physician is becoming more and more intimate. So much for the origin of the movement.

The charge that my colleague, Dr. Worcester, claims, "in a popular periodical for women," to have treated Arterio-Sclerosis, Dementia Præcox, Exophthalmic Goitre, Hemiplegia, Locomotor Ataxia, Manic Depressive Insanity,† Osteo-arthritis, Paranoia, Polio-myelitis, Lateral Sclerosis and Tumor is enough to make one rub one's eyes and wonder whether Dr. Hamilton is not himself suffering from some hallucination. As no patient can reach Dr. Worcester or his associates except with the consent of the physician who has diagnosed the case, it is obvious that, even if this charge were true, the burden of guilt would rest on Dr. Hamilton's professional brethren who lend them their services. But is the charge true? Does Dr. Worcester claim to have cured any of these cases? As a matter of fact, he claims nothing of the sort. What he says is that these, among other types of disease, were "examined *or* treated."‡ Our critic is so carried away with

* "*Ein schlecter Psychologe wird nie ein guter Lungenarzt sein.*"—"*Die Tuberculose*," p. 931.

† The place of this disorder is doubtful. Some hold that a remission may be caused or at least hastened by psychotherapy.

‡ I quote Dr. Worcester's exact words: "Looking over our recent records, I find that the following cases have been examined or treated during the past year"—then follows a list of troubles, "organic," "functional" and "mixed" cases. See "Ladies' Home Journal," November, 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

righteous indignation, with lofty scorn, for our "unpardonable ignorance" that he is unable to discharge the elementary duty of a critic, namely, to read carefully the language which he criticises. May I ask whose ignorance may now fairly be described as "unpardonable"? It is true that many organic cases were submitted to us and examined, but they were all rejected, with the exception of certain cases sent by well-known specialists in the hope of obtaining mental and moral results, which, as a rule, were obtained.

In his long argument against hypnotism, our critic still pursues the futile, if laborious, occupation of vigorously thrashing straw men. It is to be regretted that he continues the unscientific usage of speaking of hypnotism as having therapeutic power. It is, of course, the suggestion offered when the patient is in a hypnotic state that constitutes the curative agency; but let that pass. What I wish to emphasize is that hypnotic suggestion is used in the Emmanuel Clinic only in a very limited group of cases, perhaps not two per cent. of the whole—cases of Alcoholism and other deep-rooted moral perversions which resist all ordinary methods; further, that hypnotic suggestion is administered only by the authority and under the supervision of physicians. Therefore, the argument has little or no bearing upon the subject in hand. Nevertheless, I venture to think that, when Dr. Hamilton quotes Doctors C. K. Mills, Kirchhoff, Regis and de Fursac in condemnation of this suggestive method, it would have tended to a more scientific presentation of the subject had he quoted from expert authorities on the other side. I will therefore endeavor to supply this deficiency.

August Forel, formerly Professor of Psychiatry in the University of Zürich, and admittedly a great authority in mental and nervous diseases, asserts that he, as well as Liébeault, Bernheim, Wetterstrand, van Eeden, de Jong, Moll and other followers of the Nancy School had never seen a single instance in which mental or physical harm had been caused by hypnotic suggestion. No complete record of their cases has been published, but the number certainly exceeds fifty thousand.*

In addition to the competent observers already named, Janet, Sidis, Prince, Bramwell, Krafft-Ebing, Schrenck-Notzing, have

* See "Hypnotism: Its History, Practice and Theory," by J. Milne Bramwell: London, 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

used hypnotic suggestion for therapeutic or experimental purposes, and have thereby thrown an immense flood of light on abnormal mental states, which could not have been obtained in any other way. It has cured all sorts of functional disorders; it has healed dissociations of consciousness; it has unified the states of multiple personality; it has eliminated obsessions and fixed ideas; it has broken the force of evil habits so as to give a chance for conscious moral powers to be evoked and strengthened. There is no physical method of treatment, according to the best authorities, that can uproot an obsession, or modify an abnormal sexual perversion, or unify a dissociated personality, or cure functional losses of memory, or reconstitute deteriorated character; whereas all these things have been done by suggestion in hypnosis or by some allied form of suggestion.

Adolf Meyer, formerly Director of the Pathological Institute of New York, recently appointed Professor of Psychiatry in Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, testifies that many abnormal mental states are mental maladjustments; and he says that, in meeting these maladjustments, psychotherapy is invaluable. He also states that psychotherapy is a regulation of action, and that suggestion is merely a step to that end.*

In face of the contradiction among medical writers on this subject, it would ill become me to decide which is right. Unhappily, Dr. Hamilton's own contribution to the discussion is of little value. He contents himself with repeating the usual popular objections, which can be found answered in any good textbook on the subject. What we really need is a clear, impartial and scientific investigation into the limits of suggestive therapy, with an equally clear and cogent proof of any dangers that may exist and of the method by which these dangers may be minimized or avoided. Meanwhile, it cannot be too often repeated that the Emmanuel effort is quite independent of this therapeutic procedure. Its use is so limited as to be practically negligible.

Dr. Hamilton says, very properly, that suggestion should be administered only by skilled hands. The same is, of course, true of any therapeutic procedure, and it ought to reassure our critic to learn that the fundamental rule of the Emmanuel work is that no patient shall be treated psychotherapeutically except by a psychologically trained physician, or by a psychologically

* See "American Journal of Insanity," July, 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trained clergyman in conjunction with the physician, or by a trained social worker under the direction of physician and clergyman. If any unskilled or uneducated person claims to act in a psychotherapeutic capacity under the ægis of the Emmanuel Movement, his claim is false, and his ignorance or bad faith is not to be set down to the discredit of the men who are trying to conduct this work in a conservative, sensible and scientific way.

When Dr. Hamilton quoted the reply of Dr. James W. Putnam, of Buffalo, to a statement I am alleged to have made about the percentage of persons hypnotized—that "if ninety per cent. of the people can be hypnotized, then I would say that ninety per cent. of the people should never be hypnotized"—he forgot to add that nobody outside a lunatic asylum would ever make the suggestion which Dr. Putnam deprecated.

Dr. Hamilton, at the close of his paper, makes a pathetic plea for the restoration of the old family physician, who "brought children and grandchildren into the world" and who gave them a "painless and happy" exit. It is almost impossible to praise the old family physician too highly; but wherein lay the secret of his success? Was it in his pills and potions, his plasters and boluses; or was it not much more in his kindly, genuinely humane personality, in the relations of friendship which he established with the household? In a word, was it not in the indirect power of suggestion which his very presence brought into the sick-room? And what is this but our old friend, psychotherapy, which Dr. Hamilton regards with such contempt?

It is a depressing reflection that the advocate of a rational faith has to-day a very difficult path to tread. He is exposed to the cross-fires of mutually antagonistic minds. The Christian Scientist accuses him of unbelief and lack of faith when he refuses to tie down the Almighty to any one mode or method of cure; the champion of a pedantic and scholastic science flings at him the charge of superstition and occultism; while in reality what he is trying to do, under whatever limitation and with whatever weakness, is to give to science the things of science and to faith the things of faith. The champion of a rational faith cannot, with Christian Science, commit intellectual suicide and stultify all human knowledge; nor can he, at the bidding of a scientific dogmatism, give up his trust in the spiritual foundations of human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

life. He is convinced, for example, of the truth which modern psychology never tires of proclaiming—the unity and interaction of mind and body, the solidarity of brain and thought. Dr. Hamilton does not appear to take this truth seriously, much less does he regard with favor the fact, now established, that in certain cases and in certain environments sound religion is a therapeutic power. No wonder he permits himself to sneer mildly at some words of Professor James. Now, Professor James may be right or wrong; but we may be sure of one thing: that even the blunders and mistakes of such an open, generous and prolific mind are more valuable than the most certain conclusions of the mind pedantic and traditional. *Errare malo cum Platone quam cum Pythagora vera sentire.*

SAMUEL MCCOMB.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR AND GERHARDT C. MARS.

"THE SHADOW WORLD."*

If there is anything more mysterious than the psychic forces that interpenetrate our life, it is the instinctive determination of the average intelligent human being to ignore them, even, so far as possible, to discredit them. Thus, ignorance of these matters has in itself become a fetish and a superstition; consideration of them a practice involving disrepute. Not only will we ourselves know nothing of occult mysteries,—is the usual unspoken formula; we will suspect anybody who attempts to know. These things being true, the reasons why it is desirable to publish such a book as Mr. Hamlin Garland's "Shadow World" become plain. A simple outline of a vast and loosely understood subject could not be more sanely given. It is true that superficially the book has irritating qualities. The invention of characters and dialogue, exceedingly tame when compared with the essential material, and the attempt thus to string the material on a fictional thread unnecessarily obscure a narrative otherwise lucid. But inasmuch as the book does not ask consideration as literature, its faults, which might be intolerable in a work of fiction, may be passed over. What the "Shadow World" really is is a substantial popular tract. Readers who are themselves investigators, or who are familiar with the authorities from whom Mr. Garland liberally and aptly quotes, have probably no need of a book that does not pretend to offer new discoveries or fresh theories. And the book is emphatically not of a quality to recommend it to the philosopher or the mystic. But the every-day

* "The Shadow World." By Hamlin Garland. New York: Harper & Brothers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hard-headed obstructionist should profit from the wholesome bewilderment it will afford him.

Mr. Garland, as his book tells us, fearlessly undertook the investigation of the Shadow World in the companionship of a group of men and women and with the assistance of several successive mediums who, it is of course understood, were restrained by "test conditions" rigid enough to exclude the possibility of fraud. The results, startling as many of them are, correspond in a general way to those that are usually obtained in such cases. There appears to be no reason why scores of such books could not have been produced. They have not, however; and that fact gives this volume a peculiar if accidental value. It is a clear-eyed and quite unimaginative piece of reporting, without metaphysical, religious or literary bias, of a series of phenomena that included levitation, telekinesis, trance impersonations and even, in one case, materialization. Happenings so dispassionately observed and certified to, the ghost-denying man cannot merely brush aside as nonsense.

While bound and nailed to their seats by a tangle of torturing devices, Mr. Garland's mediums evoked lusty and muscular (but invisible) phantoms who spoke in loud voices, made jokes and laughed uproariously at them, wrote voluminously on sheets of paper, hurled books and other objects about the room and displayed alert and responsive intelligence. Personal "spirit-messages" were not the object of the sittings and this phase of the subject is touched upon lightly. Nevertheless, the chapter that will probably arouse the keenest popular interest is one falling precisely within this province in that it describes alleged communications from the dead composer, Edward MacDowell, who was a close friend of Mr. Garland. This "spirit," manifesting itself first through slate-writing, later in whispers, strove eagerly to dictate a musical composition, but found both Mr. Garland and the medium unequal to the task of co-operating. At the next sitting, therefore, another friend, Henry B. Fuller, the author, was called in and the score was completed at the "spirit's" energetic dictation. "In all this work," Mr. Garland says, "(MacDowell) carried himself like the creative master. He held to a plane apparently far above the psychic's musical knowledge, and often above that of his amanuensis. He was highly technical throughout in both the composition and the playing, and (Fuller)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

followed his will, for the most part, as if the whispers came from (MacDowell) himself."

Every detail of this remarkable experience is well worth reading. Not a feature of it was trivial or incoherent. A spirit could hardly manifest itself in a more dignified and convincing manner. The account of it will perhaps seem, even to many intelligent persons, as an absolute proof of the spiritualistic theory. And yet Mr. Garland declares himself unable to believe that the apparent personality present at these sittings, vocal, even creative as it was, was anything more than a compounding of the psychic, Mr. Fuller, and himself, with perhaps the addition of "fugitive natures afloat in the ether."

Which leads to the theory of these marvels, most of which are, after all, as old as history. And this theory is one that the person who has been panic-stricken lest he should have to accept spiritualism may find some satisfaction in reading about. The spiritistic interpretation of all apparently supernormal phenomena has always been the vulgar one; the interpretation, that is, of children, of savages, of the untutored everywhere. But it has also, after many years of profound study, been that of the most competent investigators in England and America, from the sublimely reasonable Mr. Myers to the rather truculent Dr. Hyslop. However, it is the opposite view that is now maintained by the most eminent European investigators and that is suggested, tentatively and quite without dogmatism, by the author of this book. It seems to him that all the phenomena recorded by himself, as, for that matter, all those recorded anywhere, are covered by the biologic theory, which assumes that no single psychic manifestation originates outside the medium; that the medium has power to project his mental and physical energy (accomplishing telepathy, telekinesis, etc.); that (in explanation of materializations) he has also power to project his own "fluidic double," or, in some cases, an indefinite "ideoplastic" vapor which he is able to mould into any shape by the action of his mind; and that all "controls" and "spirits" are parasitic personalities of the medium or some one present with him. Perhaps it depends upon the individual mind whether these assumptions shall seem more or less vast than those of the spiritistic theory. In any case, it is astonishing that anything can seem more important to us, more engrossing, than the issue between these momentous alternatives.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We are either, many of us, magicians, vehicles of incalculable forces, airy demonstrators of the penetrability of matter, blithe trippers into fourth-dimensional space, mothers of magically born beings who are made of our very substance and who return to remerge themselves into that substance;—we are all this, or we are in practically constant communication with a world of discarnate intelligences. Yet few of us appear to care profoundly what the truth of it may be. Most of us are content to leave the whole matter in the hands of a small society of investigators. It is true that affiliation with the unseen is not the attribute of every temperament; but everybody can learn to accept the fact,—sufficiently established in this single book of Mr. Garland's,—that the human body is the lodging-place of miracles.

What we call "popular science" is peculiarly congenial to the American mind. Would Americans regard psychic matters with greater respect if they should become able to dissociate them from spiritualism, to class them as science rather than as religion? Would the astonishing facts that Mr. Garland has done a genuine service in simply setting forth then come to seem approximately as important as a surgical operation or a machine for multiplying the horrors of war?

OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR.

"SCIENCE AND IMMORTALITY."*

ALTHOUGH the belief in immortality rests essentially upon certain broad rational grounds, familiar and open to all, the author of the present volume pleads for the worth of the contributory evidence, offered by scientific investigation, in support of continued personal existence after death. His general position is that set forth in Myers's monumental work on "Human Personality." That is, there lies not only beyond the subliminal activities of any given patient, but also beyond any possible explanation of telepathy, a considerable body of psychic phenomena, carefully sifted by thorough scientific methods, which can be accounted for alone on the supposition of veritable messages from discarnate intelligences.

That such phenomena are meagre, or for the most part trivial,

* "Science and Immortality." By Sir Oliver Lodge, F.R.S. New York: Moffat, Yard & Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in no way diminishes their evidential value; but they should be strictly guarded from the abuse of charlatans or of shallow and enthusiastic supporters who always bring any cause they advocate into discredit, and should be restricted to the painstaking investigations of science.

The problem of immortality, however, occupies but one of the four sections that constitute Sir Oliver's richly suggestive volume. His deepest concern seems to be, as a steward of the mysteries of physical science, to help "to prepare the way, in some slight degree, for the Coming of the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth," by showing the consistency of science and faith in general, but more especially the consistency of science and Christianity, the fundamental doctrines of which, "embodying the most vital truths known to mankind, can be interpreted and assimilated by advanced thought." Involved in the accomplishment of this purpose there is a discussion of Corporate Worship and Service in which are found valuable suggestions toward increasing the efficiency of the National Church, by harmonizing its various parts into a closer union, and by adjusting it more completely to modern conditions.

Our author begins by squarely confronting orthodox science, as represented by the average Fellow of the Royal Society, with orthodox faith, as represented by the average Christian theologian. These two present two quite distinct conceptions of the universe. The conception of science is

> "that of a self-contained and self-sufficient universe, with no outlook into or links with anything beyond, uninfluenced by any life or mind except such as is connected with a visible and tangible material body";

while the conception of faith is

> "that of a universe lying open to all manner of spiritual influences, permeated through and through with a Divine Spirit, guided and watched by living minds, acting through the mechanism of law, indeed, but with intelligence and love behind the law; a universe by no means self-sufficient or self-contained, but with sensitive tendrils groping into another supersensitive order of existence, where reign laws hitherto unrecognized by science, but laws as real and as mighty as those by which the natural universe is governed."

The opposition between these two views really turns upon the efficacy of prayer and all it implies of helpful influences from a realm higher than the visible world, and of a continued exist-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence in that higher world beyond death. We have already seen what Sir Oliver says concerning the possibility of a future life; what is to be said concerning the possible interrelation between the scientific material and the religious spiritual worlds?

The most fundamental teaching of science is found in her doctrine of Natural Law, expressing the Uniformity of Nature, considered either as a static *relation among* things or as an evolving, dynamic *progress of* things. On first view, this would seem to present a system of inescapable necessity which entirely crushes out rational freedom and the ideal values of religion altogether, renders prayer meaningless, and the old friendly interference of supernatural help absurd.

But on further view, it comes to be seen that in reality the essential significance of religion is greatly enhanced by the scientific conception of Law and Uniformity, for it represents the Power back of the universe, upon which religion depends, as immanent in the universe, forever answering prayer and working a perpetual miracle. Only prayer must now no longer be taken as a means to secure the gratification of mere personal whims, but rather as an intelligent striving of the human toward the divine; nor must miracle any longer be taken as an intermittent *infringement of* the natural order, but recognized rather as the wonder of a permanent and uniform *control over* the natural order.

It is the nature of this overlying control or guidance that lifts us above slavish subjection to a mere mechanical necessity into a realm of free intelligence and rational mind. For a system of things which first reveals above its necessary, mechanical interrelations, the intelligent control of life, and then, above life, the creative activities of human thought and will, must have, as its ground, a Divine Reason infinitely above that of man and immanent as a guiding principle throughout the universe.

It is in the light of this rational control that science and religion find a common ground. All is uniformity, law, changeless order, which it is the business of science to investigate and understand; while at the same time the need of religion is supplied in a friendly Power, akin to man, forever working on his behalf.

"Miracles lie all around us; only they are not miraculous [in the old sense of exceptional, arbitrary interference]; special providences

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

envelop us; only they are not special [in the sense of favoring personal privilege]; and prayer is a means of communication as natural and simple as is speech [in the sense of winning power and mastery by understanding and obedience]."

This transformation, in our thought, of the world, by which it becomes one great system of law and order, pervaded throughout and controlled by immanent Divine Intelligence, necessitates a transformation, in our thought, of Christian doctrine, a transformation which indeed many enlightened theologians desire or seek to effect. With some hesitation and yet under the sense of an obligation to utter the best in him, Sir Oliver undertakes to suggest various changes in our interpretation of Christianity which our scientific view of the world most pressingly demands. Thus, with our larger conception of the miraculous, not as an arbitrary *interference in* the course of nature, but as a pervasive intelligent *control over* the course of nature, the supernormal birth of Jesus or His physical ascent into Heaven have no meaning. The one-sided, human origin of Jesus in no way increases his capacity to reveal God to us, but rather decreases it; for not only does it cast discredit upon the *entirety* of God's immanence in nature, but makes it futile for earth-born men to try to follow, as they are urged, the example of Christ. So far as the Ascension is concerned, its only significance can be that of an advance to higher planes of spiritual consciousness; as an ascent to regions of space above the blue, it can have no meaning whatever to our modern thought.

The doctrines of divine wrath and of sin can no longer be held in the old way. Sin is a reversion to a lower type, and divine wrath may be regarded as expressing the painful result of wrong-doing. The only sense in which the divine wrath can be understood is that in which it displayed itself in the bitter denunciation of Jesus against the presumptuous superiority of self-asserted goodness. In its literal sense, it can have no meaning as God's displeasure with the vast majority of men, struggling along amid the narrow limitations of their ignorance and weakness, and who need pity and help rather than wrath and punishment.

In like manner the deep truth underlying the Atonement must have restatement. We can no longer think of a substituted penalty in terms of the old Roman code. The atonement of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jesus was not a bloody sacrifice to appease the wrath of a jealous God against sin, but the sacrifice of love, stooping to endure the contradictions of sin, and, thus overcoming them, to show man the way to his own divine self-realization as a son of God.

In view of such considerations, we must form our views of the nature of Christ and his work. Aside from all ecclesiastical and dogmatic accretions, the essential constituents of Christianity are spiritual and practical—the worship of God as a Spirit and the service of man as a brother. But these elements in themselves do not sharply enough distinguish Christianity from other great religious creeds, and we must seek a still more fundamental substratum upon which its detailed words and teachings rest. And this ultimate ground-element of Christianity, Sir Oliver believes, he finds in "the conception of a human God; of a God, not apart from the universe, not outside it and distinct from it, but immanent in it; yet not immanent only, but actually incarnate as revealed in the Incarnation." In a very broad sense, the nature of God is revealed in everything, but most clearly and fully in the highest type of man as seen in Christ. According to the Hegelian phrase, God comes to consciousness in man; and this conception "welds together Christianity and Pantheism, and Paganism and Philosophy." It adds to the humanity of Christ, which is unique only by reason of its spiritual altitude, the divinity of Christ which gives value and meaning to His humanity, and which, however exceptional, is yet within the reach of humanity. "Ye are the sons of God."

Bewildering as this thought may be, it is a truth dimly and partially seen by all the prophets, and doubtless by many of the pagan saints, but more especially is it the revelation of Christ Himself. That God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself is the hope of humanity, for it brings God very near to men "in their midst and of their fellowship, sympathizing with their struggles, rejoicing in their successes, and evoking, even in their own poor nature, some dim and broken image of Himself."

The value of Sir Oliver's admirable volume, which has grown out of previous articles in the "Hibbert Journal" and the "Contemporary Review," does not lie in any striking originality of thought, but in the fact of its existence as a rational mediation between science and religion. The attempt to adjust tradition-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alism to any given modern culture is as old as civilization. It is always the attempt to reconcile the rationalism of science, with its subjection to the facts and laws of a necessitated order of things, and the mysticism of religion, with its individual self-determined freedom and its devotion to the higher values of the spiritual life. In our day such a reconciliation seems more nearly possible than ever before. Only a generation ago the prevailing tendency of science was to restrict itself dogmatically to its rationalism, and to shut out, as unworthy of serious consideration or as unproductive of valid results, any claims of mysticism upon which religion rests; while religious men, compelled indeed to admit the advance of scientific doctrine, met the difficulty by exhausting their ingenuity in subjecting the new ideas to their old statements. Science was inclined to claim to know too little; religion, as always, was inclined to claim to know too much.

But to-day, science and religion are, if not altogether friendly, at least on speaking terms, because science, beginning to recognize the inadequacy of mere natural knowledge to satisfy the highest interests of man, is inclined to admit a valid realm of thought and investigation beyond the domain of a strict dogmatic rationalism; while religion, beginning to recognize the inadequacy of the traditionally infallible statements of doctrine, is showing itself, not only willing, but anxious for a restatement of the old doctrines in modern terms.

We have in Sir Oliver a happy combination of both these modern tendencies. Though, strictly speaking, a scientific man, he is at the same time deeply imbued with the spirit of religion. Fully alive to the claims of scientific rationalism, he yet clearly sees its incompetence to cover the entire field of man's rational interests, just because it needs to be supplemented, and, indeed, completed, by those truths of mysticism which form the ground of religion. His general position as a mediator recalls that of Lotze, who, in the hottest of the fight between science and religion, fully appreciated both, by recognizing as the realm of science the *facts* and *laws* of a strictly necessitated mechanical order which, however, have no meaning until subordinated to those *values* which constitute the life of religion.

GERHARDT C. MARS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: PARIS: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *February, 1909.*

BY the time this letter appears in print Parliament will have assembled once more. The session is bound to prove a momentous one. There is a very general feeling that the Government has reached the turning-point in its career and that on the policies and tactics it now adopts will depend very largely its future fate. The situation is not one that lends itself to an easy summary. The cross-currents are many and confusing and the most astute prophets confess themselves unable to see far ahead. Some things, however, seem definite and assured; and one of them is that the Government is losing ground. It has passed many admirable measures during the three years of its existence and its handling of foreign and Imperial affairs has been uniformly successful. But it is now undeniably face to face with the tokens of incipient reaction. Part of the reaction is due to the natural swing of the pendulum and to the lassitude that invariably follows a great burst of reforming energy; part, also, to a suspicion that property is being jeopardized by the radical measures of the Government and by its supposed subservience to the Labor group; part, again, to the unpleasant but unavoidable necessity of finding the money for the free and daring policies of social betterment on which the Ministry has embarked; and part, finally, to the hitherto ineffectual and slightly ridiculous campaign which Mr. Asquith has initiated against the House of Lords.

This last, from the purely Parliamentary standpoint, is the governing factor. The House of Lords has blocked the Government in four different directions. It has rejected its scheme for abolishing plural voting, its Education Bill, its Scottish Land Bill and its Licensing Bill—four open rebuffs that no sophistry can possi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bly minimize. The Liberals, to do them justice, have made no attempt to minimize them. They have, if anything, rather tended to magnify both their seriousness and their effects. Mr. Asquith two months ago invited his followers to treat the House of Lords question as "the dominant issue." His followers have joyously responded to the appeal. Every Liberal meeting during the past few weeks has re-echoed with denunciations of the Upper Chamber and with dark threats that "a time will come" when its power of veto must be and will be stringently abridged. But the effect of these fulminations is considerably discounted, first, by the momentary popularity of the House of Lords, secondly, by the unpopularity in certain circles of some of the Bills which it threw out, and, thirdly, by the ample record of legislative successes which stands to the Government's credit and for which every Liberal orator is careful to claim on behalf of his party the full measure of popular gratitude and applause. Nine out of ten of the Government's Bills become law with the assent of the House of Lords; and it is extremely difficult for a Liberal who has been "pointing with pride" to the nine successes and assuring his audience that they represent a legislative output of unsurpassed beneficence and practicality, to build up a convincing case against the Lords as an arbitrary, irresponsible and obstructive Chamber on the strength of the single failure. Everything that the Liberals say in their own praise is a left-handed endorsement of the wisdom with which the House of Lords uses its powers. Every measure that they have passed has received the sanction, if not always the approval, of the Upper Chamber which they are now denouncing as an intolerable obstacle to the fruition of the Liberal programme. What, therefore, it amounts to is that the Liberals while claiming, and with absolute justice, that they have done magnificently and that no Government has ever done as well, complain that, but for the Lords, they might have done still better. The country, in my judgment, does not accept a complaint of this nature as sufficient excuse for remodelling the entire Constitution. It is not, however, on that account to be taken as satisfied either with the composition of the Upper Chamber or with its Constitutional prerogatives. It recognizes many anomalies in the first and much unfairness to the Liberals in the second. It does not, however, regard the unfairness as sufficient to justify what would in effect be Single Chamber government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The more ardent Radicals, however, by no means subscribe to this view of the drift of popular opinion and believe they have everything to gain by forcing the fight against the House of Lords. When the Licensing Bill was rejected they urged the Prime Minister to dissolve at once. They assured him that the Government must either stand up to the Lords or abdicate. They threw at him his own declaration that the Government meant to "stand or fall" by its Licensing Bill. Mr. Asquith, however, was not to be hurried. While not abandoning the campaign against the Lords, while, on the contrary, putting it in the forefront as "the dominant issue," the Government clearly intends to stay in office as long as possible and to dissolve at a moment and on a ground of its own choosing. I am far from saying that this decision is a bad one. But it is clear that it carries with it certain important implications. It practically debars them from introducing measures that every one knows beforehand will be thrown out by the Upper Chamber. Among the latter class of measures is the Bill for disestablishing the Church in Wales. Welshmen, who are overwhelmingly Nonconformist, have long desired this Bill. They have been among the most steadfast supporters of the Liberals because Welsh disestablishment has been a prominent item on the Liberal programme for the last twenty years. The present Government is pledged to it. But what is the use of bringing it forward in a Bill which, after occupying nearly the whole of a session in the House of Commons, is destined to rejection in the House of Lords? To do so would be simply to invite another rebuff from the Upper Chamber—a rebuff that the Government would resent in words but not in deeds, that it would denounce on every platform, but that it would take care not to meet by the counterstroke of a dissolution. On the other hand, not to do so is to put a severe strain on the allegiance of the group, a very important group, of Welsh Liberals. It is to ask them to subordinate the one measure which they particularly care about to the general necessities of the Government's position. And what holds good for the Welshmen holds equally good for the measures of other groups. All of them must be invited to postpone the special reforms in which they are interested in order to avoid a conflict with the Lords. The Government meanwhile is to introduce such measures of social reform as it thinks likely to meet with Lord Lansdowne's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

approval, is to devise and carry through two "democratic" Budgets, and then at the end of a couple of years is to take the sense of the electorate on what it has done and on what it has been prevented from doing.

Such seems to be the general intention of the Ministry. It has many obvious disadvantages. It asks an enormous amount of patience and restraint and self-sacrifice on the part of the various sections that compose the Liberal party. It is not a heroic policy; it is scarcely even a fighting policy. It is a confession that the Government is not yet prepared to join decisive issue with the Upper Chamber. It is therefore an encouragement to the Lords to prune, alter and mutilate the Ministerial proposals as they please. Every government, as time goes on, becomes weaker and less energetic. The moral authority of this Government is already on the wane and its tactics seem to imply that the moral authority of its principal opponent shall increase at its expense. These are serious objections; so serious, indeed, that the alternative of a brisk, forcing session with a dissolution immediately after the Budget, and an appeal to the country on the current issues of the Government's record, Free Trade and the House of Lords, is naturally favored in many quarters. The one thing that would be absolutely fatal would be to try to combine both schemes of strategy—that is to say, to put forward highly contentious measures, to see them rejected or emasculated by the House of Lords, and then to go on as though nothing had happened. If that course is adopted, if the country becomes convinced that the Government is afraid to risk a dissolution in order to assert itself against the Upper Chamber, then the next general election may see the disappearance of even this mighty Liberal majority. Personally, I believe that such a catastrophe may be avoided if the Government concentrates on the work of social and financial reform and avoids prematurely challenging the House of Lords. There are three first-class measures to which it stands committed. One of them, the Irish Land Bill, has already been introduced and its provisions lend themselves to compromise. The other two are a Bill remodelling the Poor Law and one reforming the electoral system. Of these the measure dealing with the Poor Law is by far the more important. It is indeed the most important task of social reorganization to which any British Government has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

addressed itself in the past thirty years; and if accompanied, as it should be, and I believe will be, by schemes for dealing with the cognate problems of unemployment, housing, town-planning and labor bureaus, will be sufficient in itself to engross the energies of Parliament for another three or four sessions. The Electoral Reform Bill is naturally the last work to which the Government will set its hand, as its passage, by the custom of the Constitution, is followed at once by a dissolution.

Next to the House of Lords the governing consideration is finance. The coming session, indeed, will be mainly occupied with the Budget and everybody is already speculating on the scope and nature of Mr. Lloyd George's proposals. His task is not an enviable one. The Liberals hitherto have not failed to show a surplus and their financial policy has, indeed, been one of their most satisfactory achievements. In the first three years of their administration they have paid off debt to the extent of $230,000,000. At the same time they have halved the sugar tax, repealed the coal duty, halved the increase of the tea duty, reduced the income tax on the smaller earned incomes by three-pence on the pound, and lightened the annual burden of taxation by some $37,000,000. This year, however, they have a different and less pleasing tale to tell. Instead of a surplus there will be a realized deficit of some twenty-five or thirty million dollars. The Old Age Pensions scheme has cost already considerably more than the Government anticipated and the yield in all departments of revenue has fallen off. Moreover, it is common ground that the Navy estimates for the coming year must be substantially increased and that various projects of social reform will also necessitate new expenditure. No one can yet say definitely how much the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be obliged to raise by fresh taxation if he means to pay his way; but $75,000,000 does not appear to be an extravagant estimate. The Tariff Reformers view the situation without any very great solicitude. The greater the deficit, they calculate, and the heavier the burden of direct taxation, the more inclined will England be to resort to their panacea of Protection. Mr. Lloyd George, however, is confident that he will be able to frame a Budget that will bring him in all the money he needs without departing from Free-Trade principles.

But difficult as is the position of the Government, that of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Opposition is more difficult still. It is weak in numbers, weaker in ability, weakest of all in unity. A semi-secret, extremely theatrical body of Tariff Reform stalwarts, calling themselves the Confederates, have during the past few weeks pointed an ultimatum at the heads of the Free Traders who still remain in the Unionist camp, demanding their resignation or their conversion to Mr. Chamberlain's programme; and there is, I think, no doubt whatever that a vigorous effort will be made to drum out of the party all who fail to subscribe to the new gospel. But the resultant unity will be only superficial and will be purchased at the cost of losing some of the most brilliant members of the old Unionist organization. There are many signs that the country is turning against the Government; there are very few that it is turning towards Tariff Reform; and the idea that a fiscal revolution of such magnitude can be carried out by a small chance majority seems to me incredible.

PARIS, *February, 1909.*

IF a man who had not heard anything about the foreign politics of France for two or three years were suddenly informed of their present state he would be pleasantly surprised. First, the Moroccan difficulty is over; and, in spite of what the Opposition papers may say to the contrary, the two years' campaign has yielded material results. It is true that France has no more footing in Morocco than she had when the broil began, and that the Sultan whom she was supposed to defend was ousted by the Sultan whom she nominally opposed. But it is also certain that her moral influence in the Mogreb is measurably superior to what it was three years ago; that such a thing as the Casablanca affair would now be an impossibility; that Moulay Hafid is more reliable than his brother; and that, in the event of another Algeciras conference, the French delegate would be, quite naturally, looked upon as the party chiefly concerned. In the second place, and in consequence of General d'Amade's successful operations, the French Government has been, for the first time since the establishment of the Republic, in a position to say a decided nay to Germany, as it did in the affair of the deserters from the Foreign Legion, and Chancellor von Bülow alluded to that occurrence in his next address to the Reichstag without any of his former sourness. Lastly, the confused, knotty, fearfully dangerous questions raised

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Austria during the last five months may be regarded as settled without any detriment to the relations of France with England, Italy, Turkey or even Germany, and the flagging Franco-Russian alliance has regained in combined action strength which it sadly needed.

On the other hand, many a foreign traveller visiting this country, with his own national difficulties uppermost in his mind, would envy it its apparent tranquillity. There is no racial or language question, as in Austria and Germany; no deep anti-constitutional feeling, as in Russia and even in Germany; no dangerous religious agitation, in spite of the soreness left by the Combes policy; no immediate danger from threatening unemployed, as in England; in short, there is no visibly disturbing element. Business is not flat; the Senatorial elections of January returned an overwhelming majority in favor of the Government; everything seems to be as it should be. It is true that the Royalist leaders of the *Action Française* gain ground every day and make more noise than ever; but it is no less certain that a Monarchist Restoration has not the slightest chance, apart from some catastrophe,—a revolution or a war,—and that M. Maurras's riotous outcry is hardly heard outside the precincts of the Sorbonne.

So would the present conditions of France appear to the native Rip Van Winkle and to the intelligent foreign observer. Yet it would not be long before both noticed, under the superficial tranquillity, a deep and universal disquiet. The atmosphere in this apparently orderly country is charged with anxiety. One feels it the more readily by contrasting it with the buoyancy and optimism of America, or with the self-possessed hopefulness of those wise little communities, Belgium and Switzerland. Between the ebullient, successful France of 1860 or of the early years of the Republic, when the memories of the war began to give way to more cheering reflections, and the France of to-day there is as much difference as between thoughtless youth and brooding old age.

Excepting the Royalists—whose chief hope lies in the childish idea that their nostrum is the only one likely to please a weary nation—nobody looks forward to the future, and most Frenchmen dread it. The expression of this uncomfortable feeling may vary with the social strata where it is found, but everywhere it is the same feeling, and its causes are identical.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In spite of Germany's restraint in the Moroccan affair and of her official good-will in the arrangement of the difficulties in the Near East, the shadowy spectre of war cannot be conjured away. Some refuse to see it, while others will see it close at hand, but everybody speaks of it under his breath.

But the prospect of war would not be such a bugbear in a country which never used to fear war, if other causes did not magnify the danger to be apprehended from it. The fact is that France lacks self-confidence, because she feels herself a prey to influences which individuals cannot counteract, and which the leaders of the country seem more inclined to put up with, or even favor, than to fight. The sore feeling between class and class, the levelling spirit which degraded the noblest French Revolutions into mere riots, is still rife. You see it rampant in the Socialist press and the powerful Socialist organization, and it constantly finds its way into legislation. During the last two months it has been prominent in the debate on the proposed abolition of capital punishment, and in such measures as those passed by Parliament *against* capital generally (in the last articles of the Income Tax Bill), *against* employers (who are deprived of the right of fining their men), and *against* parents (who run the risk of imprisonment if they blame the teaching of a schoolmaster who, in three cases out of five, is a Socialist).

For the prevalence of this spirit the Chamber is more answerable than the Government. No Prime Minister ever stood up against the arrogance and recklessness of the Socialists like M. Clemenceau. I do not think that any of those who charge him with complaisance toward Socialists will do half as much against M. Jaurès and his noisy friends as he has done, to say nothing of his efforts to heal the wounds left behind them by MM. Combes, Pelletan and André. Yet it is a fact that he would have more freedom of action if he had not been obliged to give office to rather shamefaced converts from Socialism, like M. Briand and M. Viviani. Were it not for them he might give decisive battle to the General Confederacy of Labor, and free the country from the most formidable association for evil that has threatened a nation since the Comité de Salut Publique. Meanwhile, he can only parry the blows daily aimed at him from those quarters.

If the presence of M. Clemenceau is not enough to secure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace and order the existence of the Chamber is an active cause of mistrust and doubt, and the deputies are becoming objects of contempt and hatred.

I have often pointed out that the French Chamber is, thanks to the nonentity of the President and the Senate, the most absolute monarch in Europe. On the other hand, history shows that the French are wonderfully passive and patient, quite as much so as the Russians; and, if the Chamber chose to do its work honestly, the nation would gladly give it credit for its efforts and time for its experiments. Everybody sees that legislating has long ceased to be the easy task it used to be, when it only meant fighting for the Republican constitution (as from 1875 to 1885) or against clericalism (1880-1902). There is hardly a single question at present submitted to Parliament but involves economic consequences and an exceedingly nice discrimination of mutual rights which can, in most cases, be expressed in figures. Whether the debate be about financial or industrial legislation, about military or educational expenditure, the final vote invariably concerns private interests, and sometimes is of such far-reaching consequence that experts themselves are perplexed to ascertain its effects. Every one of the measures forced upon the attention of the Chamber by the Socialists and placed by M. Clemenceau on the Parliamentary programme is of that intricate nature.

The nationalization of the Western Railway—which, according to M. Barthou, the Minister of Public Works, only meant a trifling change in the men's caps—appears to-day to be perfectly unworkable, unless an exchange of lines is made with the neighboring Companies. Meanwhile, the railway remains in its old shocking state, and the yearly revenue loses nineteen million francs. This is the only "reform" which has actually been passed. Those now under consideration are even more difficult. The Old-Age Pensions Bill, though less ambitious than that passed at Westminster, still entails a heavy burden of about three hundred and fifty million francs a year towards which the state, departments, parishes and employers show equal reluctance to contribute. The Income Tax Bill is at present generally called the "Tax Reform Bill," and the gradual substitution of one name for the other has coincided with a gradually increasing appreciation of the difficulty involved in carrying out the transformation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it denotes. To levy a percentage on a man's income is only to do during his lifetime what the collectors do easily enough after his death. But to fix upon the relative liabilities of individuals towards the sum total of the national Budget is a work in which only the test of many years' experience can help, and the beginnings of which are sure to provoke indignant protests. I shall say by and by how the Chamber has managed to get through this impossible business.

Besides these complicated problems there are others which are intelligible to the man in the street but the solution of which is not merely a matter of understanding. Admiral Germinet states —very foolishly, too—that the French arsenals contain available ammunition in such insufficient quantity that three hours' firing would exhaust it. The Admiral is punished; but, his statement proving true and another demonstration of M. Pelletan's incompetency thus coming to light, it becomes urgent to do something for the Navy. M. Picard, the able and conscientious new Minister of Marine, makes calculations, the upshot of which is that two hundred and twenty million francs are necessary, and the Minister of Finance, who wants every penny in the Budget for his experiments in tax-reforming, threatens to resign. Again, specialists say that it has been conclusively proved by the Russo-Japanese war that the four-gun is superior to the six-gun battery, and a modification is inevitable. But, to the amazement of the layman, the four-gun battery is much more expensive than the other, and another item has to be added to the Budget. So, were it not for the occasional relaxation of a debate on capital punishment, the Chamber would constantly find itself confronted with questions involving financial consequences.

How do they approach these questions? The answer to this question will be the explanation of the uncomfortable feeling which I have been describing. Strong adjectives and adverbs are not in good taste, but if I say that the Deputies take their work lightly, it will mean a great deal more than is usually implied in the term, for levity in persons holding responsible positions is tantamount to deception and often to hypocrisy. Now the Deputies take their work exceedingly lightly. One ought not to attach serious weight to certain practical jokes in which they periodically indulge—for instance, the suppression of the *sous-préfets;* but they often dispose of most momentous questions in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exactly the same spirit. They passed the nationalization of the Western Railway with scandalous carelessness and without waiting for documents of paramount importance which the Senate took almost a year to extract from the *bureaux*. The Old-Age Pensions Bill which they have sent up to the Upper House might be the outcome of a debate in a Parliament of boys, so purely academic is it. They have spent more time on the Income Tax Bill in hand than on any of its seven predecessors, but it will take the Senate years to lick it into shape. The tactics employed were, as is usual with this ultra-Conservative Chamber, to give itself democratic airs, admitting of numberless relaxations in favor of the masses and throwing nearly the whole burden on the small fraction of persons possessing large fortunes. Special difficulties—for example, the taxing of professional profits—have been avoided by just "reserving" them, and the danger of frightening capital away is supposed to be met by threats which look very terrible on paper. The reasoning has run in the usual groove: the thing is to frame a bill anyhow, as the Senate will either throw it out or improve it, or the Cabinet will change in the interval and another Bill is sure to come up.

It is by such pretences that the Chamber has generally become objectionable to the country, and is every day losing what little influence it may have possessed as the sole active organism in the Republic. Popular discontent was crystallized by the Deputies raising their own salary to 15,000 francs, and the dullest elector enjoys a song against the "Quinze-Mille" who is supposed to represent him. I have not space enough to explain how an electoral reform which has long been advocated by a few very intelligent men, seldom in agreement about anything else, is likely to be passed, as the Deputy will be less afraid of an enlarged electoral college than of the angry local committee in his constituency. But, reform or no reform, the present Chamber will not succeed in changing a state of opinion which in other times would positively have invited a *coup d'état*.

Of the purely political situation there is little to say. Clemenceau is a martinet, and the Chamber have been twice on the point of overthrowing him. But the reaction, on both occasions, was almost comical. Who, better than Clemenceau, can fight the Socialists or possibly take the responsibility of a decision in international complications?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON, *February, 1909.*

THE second evacuation of Cuba by the United States, carried out in fulfilment of the self-denying ordinance passed by Congress in April, 1898, duly took place on the appointed day, and the island resumed the status of an independent republic. Undoubtedly, from a moral point of view, it was a memorable spectacle, which is destined to live in history. From the view-point of experience and common sense, however, the end of the American occupation was regarded with regret by almost every resident in Cuba who had any property to lose. It is probably a safe calculation that of one hundred thoroughly informed sojourners in the island there are not five who believe that the second experiment in independent government will be long-lived. Scarcely twenty-four hours had elapsed after the departure of the United States troops before a pessimistic forecast seemed to be justified, for a scandalously bad appointment to an important post was made by the new President, General Gomez, an appointment which presently he felt constrained to retract. It is taken for granted that the combination between the followers of Gomez and the followers of Zayas, which was formed at the recent election for the purpose of beating the Conservatives, will not long survive a distribution of the spoils of victory. Soon or late the Zayas faction, strengthened by disappointed members of the Gomez party, is expected to resort to insurrection, in which event may recur the necessity for a new American intervention. The question will then arise, How many times must we interfere for the restoration of order in Cuba, and for the protection of the islanders from the consequences of their own unfitness for self-government in order to make good a promise which, as events have shown, was a piece of sentimental folly? We say folly because few, if any, property-owners in Cuba will now deny that the island would be incomparably better off as a State or Territory in the American Union than it would be if permitted to continue its fitful and abortive essays in political independence.

The omens of fierce political warfare, the tumultuous massing of captains and their shouting which but a short time ago threatened President Roosevelt with quick and dire humiliation have subsided with surprising, not to say laughable, suddenness. Somehow the country has shown itself strangely indifferent to the awful usurpations of authority with which the Chief Magistrate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was charged. Even the accusation of attacks upon the freedom of the press failed to provoke the usual wide-spread outburst of indignation. Senator Tillman, rising to explain some Executive strictures on his conduct, must have recognized, when he took his seat, that President Roosevelt had got rather the best of the encounter. Nobody seems inclined to press the resolutions to investigate the right of the Chief Magistrate to withhold papers demanded by either House of Congress, though the resolutions were introduced with a loud flourish of trumpets. On the whole, though it is probable that Mr. Roosevelt has fewer friends in either chamber than has been possessed by any of his predecessors, with the possible exceptions of John Tyler and Andrew Johnson, he seems justified in the defiant consciousness that he has the people behind him, and that he will leave office with his aureole substantially untarnished.

At the hour when we write the campaign deliberately organized on the Pacific slope for the deliberate purpose of provoking the Japanese to reprisals which might lead to war seems happily to have been checked. In the States of California and Washington the proposed irritating legislation has at least been postponed. The people of that section appear to have been afflicted with megalomania since the visit of our sixteen battleships to the Pacific. They seem serenely oblivious of the fact that Japan could virtually blot their sea-coast cities out of existence before our ironclads could again round Cape Horn and come to their assistance. Truly phenomenal is the cool assurance with which the denizens of San Francisco assume that all our naval resources are to be at the beck and call of a section which in population and wealth represents only an insignificant fraction of the Republic. When one reflects that the Californians would really be at the mercy of the Japanese if a quick movement were undertaken by the latter, one cannot but marvel at the recklessness with which the former proclaim an intention of discriminating against the latter in a most invidious way—a discrimination to which no high-spirited people could be expected to submit. Happily, the inhabitants of California and Washington have at last been induced to listen to reason, and for a while, at all events, the baiting of Japanese is to cease.

Senator Knox of Pennsylvania presumably is a good Constitutional lawyer; at all events, he has been appealed to repeatedly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as such. Had he not been credited with special accomplishments in that direction he would scarcely have been appointed by President McKinley Attorney-General. Then, again, the President-elect has discharged judicial functions, and in the capacity of Judge must be supposed familiar with the provisions of the Constitution. Neither of them, however, seems to have recognized that the appointment of Mr. Knox to be Secretary of State in the Taft Administration would be a violation of the Constitution, which they will both take oaths to subserve. There is no doubt that the Federal Constitution (Article 1, Section 6, Clause 2) declares that "No Senator or Representative shall during the time *for which he was elected* be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased, during such time." Now the term for which Mr. Knox was elected Senator does not expire until March 4th, 1911, and during that term he voted to increase the salary of the Secretary of State, yet Judge Taft has designated him for the office of Secretary of State, and Mr. Knox has signified his willingness to accept the post and discharge its duties from March 4th, 1909. In view of this exhibition of oblivious disregard of a plain provision of the Constitution by a President-elect and a designated Secretary of State, some forgetfulness touching the dictates of the Federal organic law should be excusable in ordinary persons.

What can be done about the matter? A movement is on foot in Congress to repeal that part of the law increasing salaries which applies to the Secretary of State, and to maintain the salary of that post at its previous figure until after March 4th, 1911. Would not such a proceeding, while an evasion of the letter, be a violation of the spirit of the Federal organic law? Suppose Mr. Knox, instead of being a Senator, should be a Representative whose term of office would expire with that of the present Congress. Then the passage of the repealing statute proposed would simply deprive him of the increased salary for a very short time, and assure to him during by far the greater part of his term the increase for which he had voted. Would not the passage of a repealing statute for the benefit of Mr. Knox establish a dangerous precedent? Does Judge Taft wish to begin his administration with an attempt to evade the Constitution? Would it not be better to defer Senator Knox's accession to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

office of Secretary of State until after March 4th, 1911, though even for the two ensuing years it might be charged that he was profiting by an increase of pay for which he had voted? Whether Mr. Knox is or is not a rich man is patently beside the question. A course pronounced legitimate in the case of Mr. Knox would be legitimate also in respect of a man notoriously dependent on his salary for a livelihood.

The President-elect and the civil engineers whom he requested to accompany him to Panama have returned to the United States, and it is agreed upon, apparently, that the plan of a lock canal shall be carried out. It is now admitted that, if even at this time the plan were changed, a sea-level waterway could be constructed for less money than a canal with locks would cost. The die seems to be cast, however, without regard to the possible expenditure, or to the dangers which are alleged to attach to a lock system. All that onlookers, therefore, can do is to remain spectators of a venturesome experiment and hope for the best. After all, if the lock system breaks down we can always revert to the sea-level plan. There would simply have been a good many millions of dollars wasted.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

Significant Recommendations of Esperanto.

THE report of Major Paul F. Straub, delegate to the Fourth International Esperanto Congress, at Dresden, on behalf of the War Department and the United States Government, has recently been made public and is of a gratifying warmth. Major Straub gives a description of the routine of the Congress, touches upon the new academy to whose hands are intrusted any changes and adjustments that may prove necessary in the course of the growth of the language and goes on to say:

"The Esperanto language is constructed on such simple and practical lines that one can learn to read it in an incredibly short time. The rules in grammar are few, and as there are absolutely no exceptions, it requires but a few hours' study to master them. Many of the classics have been translated in Esperanto; Esperanto books have been written; newspapers and magazines are published in it, and yet it has not been found necessary to make any essential changes in the original rules formulated by the author, Dr. Zamenhof. . . . By means of a few rules laid down in the grammar, new words can be coined to meet all the requirements of Esperanto, new scientific terms can at once be modified to suit the scheme, and there is absolutely no bar to the further extension of the language.

"I am quite convinced that Esperanto, which has been on trial for twenty years and found to fulfil the conditions required of an international language, is destined to perform an important rôle in international intercourse and will eventually become of great economic value, by facilitating trade relations between various nations. It is so easily learned that any one could be taught in a very short time to conduct a business correspondence therein with foreigners, so many of whom are already familiar with it. I am led to believe that at the present time it has become of great assistance to travellers in remote parts of Europe, and I do not believe it will be very long before it will be possible to find Esperantists in every city in the world. The progress in this country will necessarily be somewhat slower than in most foreign states, as the American is more apt to be satisfied with his own language alone, but, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasons above stated, I believe that a knowledge of Esperanto is of sufficient commercial importance to justify our Government in encouraging its spread."

From a military point of view, in Major Straub's opinion, Esperanto could at this time be of the greatest use in the sanitary service, "and," he adds, "I am of the opinion that the Government would be justified in giving it official countenance." He suggests its immediate introduction into the National Red Cross Association as an elective study course. The linguistic difficulties that have been encountered in the various expeditions and wars of recent years, Major Straub urges, have emphasized the necessity of an auxiliary international neutral tongue. Esperanto, it is his belief, meets this need because it is free from the usual objections raised against previous attempts at artificial languages, and he therefore makes the following recommendation:

"In view of the extensive use already made of Esperanto in foreign Red Cross organization, it is recommended that it be brought to the attention of our National Red Cross organization, so that it may be included as an elective study in the course of instruction for Red Cross columns.

"It is also recommended that the Fifth International Congress, which is to meet in Chautauqua in 1909, be given such Governmental encouragement and assistance as may be necessary in order to make it a success, and thereby assist in accomplishing its great purpose, and to enable the committee to make such arrangements as may be necessary to put the Congress on a plane commensurate with the dignity of our great country."

To this recommendation the Surgeon-General of the United States Army, with the endorsements of the Adjutant-General and the Secretary of War, replies:

"Respectfully returned to the Adjutant-General of the Army. The study of Esperanto in the military service should be encouraged, as it is believed that the proposed international language is destined to play an important rôle in international intercourse. It is recommended that the attention of the American National Red Cross Association be called to the subject, and that authority be given to furnish it a copy of this report.

"R. M. O'Reilly, Surgeon-General, U.S. Army."

In view of all these facts we feel that Major Straub is to be congratulated on his perspicacity and the Esperantists upon the interest of Major Straub and the United States Government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED